

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR SEPTEMBER, 1838.

- Art. I. 1. *A Brief History of the Church in Upper Canada: containing the Acts of Parliament, Imperial and Provincial, Royal Instructions, &c., &c.* By WILLIAM BETTRIDGE, B.D., Rector of Woodstock, Upper Canada, one of the Deputation from the late Bishop of Quebec, &c. 8vo. London: 1838.
2. *Second Annual Report of the Colonial Missionary Society in Connection with the Congregational Union of England and Wales.* 8vo. 1838.

IF the Dissenters of this country were inclined to waive or to suspend for a time their controversy of centuries with the Established Church of England, the circumstances that are continually arising in the course of legislation to bring into discussion the points and principles on which they are at issue, would render it impossible for them to evade or to decline the contest, without betraying what they believe to be the cause of truth, and making themselves parties to unjust and injurious proceedings. On every hand, in some shape or other, the Church and State question meets the politician. It is the Tithe question in Ireland; the Church-extension question in Scotland; the Church-rate question, and the Education question, and the University question, in England; and so, in each and all of the colonies to which Episcopacy has been transplanted, carrying with it those exclusive and intolerant pretensions which are the unfailing source of ecclesiastical strife and social discord;—in the Indian presidencies, in Australia, and in the Canadas, there is a church question to be solved or got rid of. Turn which way we will, this polymorphous Kehama meets us, driving its furious course towards the Treasury. There is no escaping from the collision. ‘Let the Church of England,’ exclaims Mr. Bettridge, ‘gird up her loins to the contest which threatens her from every quarter.’

Wherefore, but because the Church is threatening us with invasion and encroachment in every quarter? Her claims are unbounded, her demands insatiable, such as no minister of the crown could ever satisfy. She is asking not only for revenues, but for territory; claiming not mere support, but domination. Disdaining to come as a suitor for state favour, she demands restitution of her ancient dowry *in the name of God*. An organ of the high-church party calls upon the Crown, 'upon the principle of having clean hands,' to 'free itself of the responsibility of holding spiritual property, i.e. holding back from God what is His.' The lay impropiators among the nobility are required to 'restore that which came to their forefathers *unlawfully*, through robbery as well as sacrilege,' and, as they would secure a reward in paradise, to 'give unto God *what is His*.' Parliament is to be asked to 'make restitution to God,' 'not as a favour, but as a debt; not as a gift, but as a restitution; not to make a boast of, but to avert the wrath of God, *whose church has been suffering these three hundred years for the spoliation inflicted by a former parliament*, lest He allow the flames which are at present smothered, but which show themselves visibly here and there, to burst out and consume us and our house.*' This is bold language for the nineteenth century; a startling assertion of the *Nullum Tempus* principle on behalf of the church; and it is accompanied with an admonitory note, from Froude's 'Remains,' which will show still more unequivocally the spirit that now worketh in the high places of the Establishment. 'When questions are raised about continuing the service for King Charles the Martyr, I answer by pointing to the case of the sinners, the Amalekites,' who 'were judged at the distance of 500 years.'

Many readers will only smile at the extravagance, others may be disposed to frown at the almost blasphemous insolence of this language. But, calmly viewed, as speaking the sentiments of a powerful and growing party which is being nursed up in the schools of Oxford, 'the Alma Mater of Laud and Sacheverell,' it supplies matter for grave reflection. The article from which it is taken breathes throughout the spirit of popery; but it is the popery of the Anglican church, which wants the ability only, not the will, to 'exercise all the power of the first beast before him.' The object of the writer is to deprecate all parliamentary interference with what calls itself The Church. The 'Plurality and Anti-cathedral Bills' are stigmatized as *lay Bills*; and the question involved in them is stated to embrace 'the whole tenure and distribution of church property and the whole legislative for the church.' It is whether the church is ever hereafter *to legislate*

* British Critic, April, 1838, pp. 540—2.

'for herself, either in synod or convocation, or to have her services, her ordinances, and her creeds at the disposal of the State; *'whether she is to retain her liberty which Christ confided to her, or to be 'in bondage with her children' to those who are not of 'her.'* Meaning, of course, the present Ministry and House of Commons. Were Toryism ever to regain political ascendancy, who shall say that a fearful struggle might not yet be required to settle the question of ecclesiastical encroachments?

The spirit which Mr. Bettridge discovers in the pamphlet before us, is that of a true son of the church. Setting out with the assumption that the interests of Zion are bound up with the pretensions of Episcopacy; and that the Protestant religion has no chance of maintaining itself in Upper Canada, except by means of the *clergy reserves*, he intimates that, if the British public should manifest an indifference to the claims he advocates, or, as he phrases it, *'to our state and establishment,'* the fate of the Amalekites will doubtless overtake us.

'We can only then await Jehovah's pleasure concerning us, assured that if He permit His authorized teachers to be removed, and the ministrations of the pure and apostolic Church of England to be disregarded, or to cease in Upper Canada, it will be a token that judgment is coming upon us to the utmost.'

In order that our readers may have a clear view of this case of Divine right, and of the extreme peril to which the nation will expose itself by slighting these prophetic denunciations, we shall give a brief abstract of the curious piece of church history detailed in Mr. Bettridge's First Part.

The division of the colony into two provinces dates from the year 1791; prior to which there could of course be no Established Church in *Upper Canada*, and the only Established Church, strictly speaking, in any part of Canada, was the Church of Rome.* The Act which the British Parliament passed in 1774,

* The Bishop of Exeter, in a recent debate in the House of Lords, (July 23,) contended that the Romish Church is not the Established Church in Lower Canada; and that the government of this country had never recognized any except prelates of the Established church as bishops of dioceses in Canada. Lord Glenelg, in reply, assured the right reverend prelate that he was mistaken on the latter point; long before the last four years, the recognition of Roman Catholic prelates had taken place, and that too by acts of the legislature,—provincial statutes that had received the sanction of the crown. But, whether the Roman Catholic bishops of Canada had been recognized or not, how can it be denied with any show of propriety, that a church is established, the clergy of which are in possession of the tithes, together with all rights, privileges, lands, or seigneuries, according to the terms of the treaty of capitulation, held prior to the conquest? As truly might the bishop affirm, that the Church of Scotland is not an Established Church in Scotland, be-

(14 Geo. III. c. 83,) ratified the articles of capitulation by which all rights, privileges, lands, or seigneuries held by the Romish church previously to the conquest, were secured. 'And then,' says our church historian, '*at a period when we might have hoped better things*, we beheld the first inroad made upon that distinctive Protestantism which pervades our entire constitution, and which, indeed, is the very foundation-stone of our monarchy.' It is a little remarkable, that the English monarchy should have had no foundation-stone before the Reformation; for this is plainly implied in the statement. The Act of Parliament, however, made no further inroad upon our Protestantism, than had been already made by treaty; and indeed, this 'distinctive Protestantism' had been necessarily compromised long before, in our North American colonies; to say nothing of our alliance with Mohammedism and paganism in the East Indies. By the Act in question, it was declared, that 'the clergy of the Church of Rome in the province of Quebec, might hold, receive, and enjoy their accustomed dues and rights with respect to such persons only as should profess the said religion; provided, nevertheless, that it should be lawful for his Majesty, his heirs and successors, to make such provision out of the rest of the said accustomed dues and rights for the encouragement of the Protestant religion and for the maintenance and support of a Protestant clergy within the said province, as he or they should from time to time think necessary or expedient.' In pursuance of this provision, which would seem to have been in itself a departure from the original terms of the treaty, by instructions from the Crown, dated Jan. 3, 1775, to the then Governor (Lord Dorchester), it had been directed, 'That no incumbent professing the said religion of the Church of Rome, appointed to any parish in the said province, should be entitled to receive any tithes for lands or possessions occupied by a Protestant,' but that such tithes should be 'reserved in the hands of his Majesty's Receiver-General of the said province, for the support of a Protestant clergy.'

We must pause to offer a reflection or two upon this singular *appropriation clause*. Nothing seemingly could be more liberal, more in accordance with enlightened policy, than the principle here laid down, that an individual professing one religion, ought not to be required to pay tithe to an incumbent professing another religion. One is delighted to find such a principle recognized by Tory statesmen in the reign of George III. Had it only been followed out in application to Ireland, how many years of civil discord and ecclesiastical animosity might have been spared!

cause it is not invested with all the powers and privileges of the English hierarchy. The Church of England in Canada is a very different thing from the Established Church of Canada.

All that would have been requisite for the settlement of the Irish Tithe question may be embodied in the simple direction, that no Protestant incumbent appointed to any parish shall be entitled to receive any tithes for land or possessions occupied by a Papist, but that such tithes shall be reserved in the hands of his Majesty's Receiver-General. Shall we be told, that our 'distinctive Protestantism' forbids a Protestant to pay tithes to a Romish incumbent, while it requires a Papist to pay tithes to a Protestant incumbent? Distinctive Protestantism must, if so, be something very distinct from Christianity, which enjoins us to do to others as we would that they should do to us; something very opposite to common-sense notions of justice and morality; in fact, a jesuitical Protestantism with which we should be ashamed to claim relationship; and the Church of England is welcome to the exclusive honour of maintaining so inequitable a principle.

At all events, if, by the Act referred to, the first inroad was made, on the one hand, on our 'distinctive Protestantism,' by these instructions from the Crown, on the other hand, a very decided inroad was made upon the fundamental principles of a Church Establishment. It matters nothing whether George III. and his ministers perceived this or not,—nor whether they would have admitted the applicability of the precedent to any other case, in which Protestants and Romanists might be placed in a reversed predicament towards each other. They probably regarded only present expediency, not troubling themselves with the political morality of the arrangement. But this makes no difference as to the fact; that the direction involved a principle which, if fairly carried out, in the spirit of equal justice, would forbid the quartering of a Protestant clergy upon a Roman Catholic people,—and, by circumscribing the claims of a church, so as to make its temporalities bear some relation to the spiritual services rendered, would introduce a very radical, but most salutary change in our ecclesiastical Establishments.

To return to the history. It does not appear that the proceeds of the tithes so appropriated by the Crown were ever actually applied to the ostensible object. The spoliation was absolute; the sacrilege as complete as that which Harry the Eighth committed in robbing the monasteries. Seventeen years had elapsed when, in 1791, 'his Majesty, Geo. III., sent a message 'to the Parliament, intimating his intention to divide the province of Quebec, and expressing his wish that a good and sufficient provision might be made by a legislative enactment for the 'support of a Protestant clergy.' In pursuance of this message from the Crown, parliament passed the Act 31 Geo. III. c. 31, which has been styled, 'the Constitutional Act of the Canadas.' By clause 56 of this Act, after setting forth, that, whereas his Majesty had been 'graciously pleased, by message to both

‘Houses of Parliament, to express his royal desire to be enabled to make a *permanent appropriation of lands* in the said provinces for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy within the same, in proportion to such lands as have been already granted within the same by his Majesty,’—it is enacted, ‘That it shall and may be lawful for his Majesty, &c., to authorize the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor of each of the said provinces, to make, from and out of the lands of the crown within such provinces, such allotment and appropriation of lands for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy within the same, as may bear a due proportion to the amount of such lands as have at any time been granted by and under the authority of his Majesty.’ In this and the ensuing clauses, we have, according to Mr. Bettridge, ‘the charter of the church’s right,’ permanent and unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians.

‘For nearly thirty years,’ he says, ‘no attempt was made to call in question the exclusive right of the Church of England to those lands called the ‘clergy reserves.’ The notion was then broached, that there is so peculiar a vagueness in the letter, and such an elasticity in the spirit of the Act, as admits of the interpretation, that the Church of Scotland at least may claim a share in the provision thus made for a Protestant clergy. . . . The pretensions of the Scotch Church to a portion of the clergy reserves, were soon succeeded by those of the friends of various other denominations of Dissenters. The subject was referred to the home government in 1818: the ministry submitted it to the law officers of the crown.’

The letter containing their opinions is addressed to Earl Bathurst, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, and is signed, ‘Christopher Robinson, R. Gifford, and J. S. Copley.’ The question to be determined, is stated to be, ‘How far, under the construction of the Act passed in the 31st year of his present Majesty (c. 31), the Dissenting Protestant ministers resident in Canada have a legal claim to participate in the lands by that Act directed to be reserved as a provision for the support and maintenance of a Protestant clergy.’ The opinion delivered was to the following effect: ‘That the provisions of the Act in question are not confined solely to the clergy of the Church of England, but may be extended also to the clergy of the Church of Scotland, if there be any such settled, in Canada; yet, that they do not extend to the Dissenting ministers, since the terms, ‘Protestant clergy, can apply only to the Protestant clergy recognized and established by law.’ That the Governor will be justified in applying the rents and profits arising from the clergy reserves to the maintenance and support of the clergy of the Church of Scotland, as well as those of the Church of England, but not to the support and maintenance of ministers of Dissenting

Protestant congregations; and that the Governor being authorized by the Act to erect parsonages or rectories only according to the Establishment of the Church of England, and to endow every such parsonage or rectory with land, it would be inconsistent with such discretionary power, that any proportion of such lands should be absolutely retained for any other clergy. In other words, the Scotch clergy might claim to participate in the *rents and profits* arising from the clergy reserves, but might not be permanently endowed with any portion of the land.

At the date of this opinion, November 1819, the only Dissenting Protestant ministers in Upper Canada were ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, chiefly of the Associate Synod. We are strongly inclined to believe, that, under the term, 'Dissenting Protestant ministers,' in the question submitted to the law officers of the Crown, it was intended to include ministers of the Established Church of Scotland, whom it has always been the policy of the Church of England to treat as Dissenters out of Scotland. This, however, is a point of small moment. It is more material that the ecclesiastical circumstances of the province at this time should be distinctly understood, in order to appreciate the wisdom of the legislature of 1791, in projecting a territorial establishment in an unsettled country upon so vicious a principle, and the modesty with which this 'charter,' after having been inoperative for nearly fifty years, is now brought forward as the basis of claims not more arrogant than intolerant.

In the year 1814, the inhabitants of the Upper province amounted to only 95,000 souls, consisting chiefly of disbanded soldiers and emigrants from the United States and Great Britain. In 1820, they were estimated by Mr. Gourlay at 134,259 souls, including 3259 Indians. The only Episcopal clergy in the province were missionaries from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, receiving their salaries from the funds of that Institution; and from the Society's Report for the year 1821, it appears that there were seventeen missionaries at seventeen stations. The number of *communicants* at that time is stated to be ONE HUNDRED and EIGHTIEN. Such was the state of the Episcopal Church of Canada, or of the Church of England in Canada, thirty-four years after the passing of the Act directing a permanent appropriation of lands for the support of a Protestant clergy! For the purposes of a provision for the clergy, the clergy reserves had been found almost useless. Upwards of 300,000 acres were leased; but, when freehold grants were obtainable at a nominal price, who could be expected to take church lands on lease, or to pay any rent for what they took? Unless the clergy had themselves farmed the reserved lands, it was absurd to imagine that they could derive a revenue from them. At length, in 1827, an Act was passed, (8 Geo. IV. c. 62,) authorizing the alienation

and sale of a portion of these lands at the rate of 100,000 acres annually; the proceeds to be funded and applied to the same objects as those contemplated by the ill-advised Act of 1791. As must be expected, this decision was satisfactory to neither party.

Between 1820 and 1825, the tide of emigration flowed into Upper Canada with surprising force; and in the latter year, the population of the province had risen to nearly 212,000. By far the majority of the new settlers were *Presbyterians from North Britain*. The settlement at Lanark, formed in 1820, was entirely composed of emigrants from Lanark, Glasgow, and other places in the West of Scotland; and the whole district of which Perth is the chief town, was settled either by discharged soldiers or by Scottish emigrants. To the latter, previously to their leaving home, Government had offered assistance towards the support of a minister, *without respect to religious denomination*; and in consequence of this offer, on the application of the settlers, the Associate Presbytery of Edinburgh sent out some ministers to undertake the charge of the congregations. In 1823, there were in the Upper province eighteen Presbyterian ministers, and thirty congregations. One minister, the Rev. William Bell, of Perth, had, in June 1823, admitted 270 communicants; more than twice the number of the whole body of Episcopal communicants in 1821: the other members of the Perth congregation amounted to 1200. At Lanark, and at Beckwith, in the same county, were congregations comprising 180 communicants.* The county of Carlton, in which they were situated, then contained more than 6000 inhabitants, distributed over twenty townships or parishes; and in these were one Episcopal clergyman, four Presbyterian ministers, one American Methodist preacher, two Roman Catholic priests, and some lay preachers.† We find Mr. Bell referring incidentally to the clergy reserves in the following terms: ‘The clergy connected with the Church of England form ‘a corporation for the management of these lots, and lease them ‘for twenty-one years, whenever they can find tenants; but, ‘as most of them lie waste, they are a great hinderance to the ‘improvement of the country.’‡

Dr. Matheson, who visited Upper Canada in 1834, thus explains the causes of the increasing jealousy and dissatisfaction produced by these reserves. ‘One (reason) was, that the government patronized one denomination exclusively; and the other ‘was, the local injury done by many of the clergy reserves remaining unsold and uncultivated; these, too, lying often in the ‘midst of plantations, and compelling the settlers to make those ‘improvements entirely at their own expense, a proportion of

* Bell's ‘Hints to Emigrants.’ 12mo. pp. 105 113. Edinburgh, 1834.

† *Ib.* p. 88.

‡ *Ib.* p. 73.

‘which should have been borne by the owners of the clergy’s land. Both these causes of discontent continued to increase, as the number of other sects still became greater, and land in the older townships became more valuable. In addition to these things, there was the spectacle constantly presented to the settlers, of land being appropriated to persons or purposes which brought no return to them in the way of religious instruction; that they were not only injured by this plan for supporting religion, but they had, after all, to seek religious instructors for themselves, and to support them at their own expense. Those who belonged to the Church of Scotland considered that they were unjustly treated, and stated, by petitions and remonstrances to the Government at home, their grievances and claims. Those in possession of course defended their rights. Thus, two rival Establishments contended for the State support. . . . Those denominations who conscientiously objected to all such plans for supporting religion, became every day more and more convinced of the utter failure of the government scheme for supplying the colony with religious instruction, and used means to provide ministers for themselves.’ *

In 1833, the population of the Upper province had risen to 322,000. The number of ministers of different Protestant denominations, as nearly as could be ascertained, was as follows:

Episcopalian clergy	40
Presbyterian ministers	34
Congregationalists	6†
Baptists	48
Methodists	73
	—
	201
	—

The increase in the last two seems remarkable. Mr. Bell, in 1823, says: ‘The Baptists have a few preachers settled in different parts of the province; but, their congregations being too small to support them, they live chiefly by agriculture.’ In 1832, 3, they had 1,976 communicants. The Methodist preachers are mostly in connexion with the American Conference, who on that account are preferred by their countrymen settled in the Canadas. In 1835, they had forty-one stations, and the number of their members was 15,106. This denomination, it is well known, acts systematically on the plan of itineracy: the Baptists and the Congregationalists do so partially. By this means, the religious destitution of the thinly peopled townships has been in some degree mitigated. The Episcopalian and Presbyterian minis-

* Reed and Matheson, Vol. II. pp. 353-5.

† Now increased to thirteen.

ters are fixed in the larger and smaller towns. 'Not more than one-half of all the ministers,' says Dr. Matheson, 'act as itinerants; and a large proportion of those who are paid by the Government, are totally indifferent as to any moral and religious results beyond their own little circle.' Taking into consideration all these circumstances, we cannot assign to the Episcopal church any thing beyond a very small section of the population; and if, with seventeen missionaries in 1821, there were only 118 communicants, it is not likely that in 1835, with even forty clergymen, the number of communicants approached that of members of the Church of Scotland or of any other communion. A letter from the Rev. Adam Elliott, in November 1834, given by Mr. Bettridge, states that, 'notwithstanding all that has been alleged concerning the numerical weakness of *the church* in this country,' so far as the writer is acquainted, 'the number of her adherents is greater than that of any other denomination' in his district. But, in parts of that same district, it is admitted that they were outnumbered by the Presbyterians; and in one township, nearly one-half were Roman Catholics. Even if the Episcopalians were the most numerous sect, they would still be to the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, and Roman Catholics collectively, but as one to five; and they form, undoubtedly, a very small minority. To estimate them at 250,000, as Mr. Bettridge does, is sheer extravagance.*

If, however, the Episcopal church would give up her vain contest for territorial possessions and political supremacy, she would have no hostility to encounter from any rival body. The spiritual destitution of the country is confessedly deplorable; and there is ample scope for the exertions of every Protestant denomination. It is simply because the Episcopal clergy will not abandon their exclusive pretensions to the patronage of the State, that they find themselves in collision with the ministers and people of every other religious body. It is not the pecuniary support of the Government that is sought for, so much as the consideration and authority supposed to be derived from that support. It is not the provision of an Establishment, but the ascendancy of an Establishment, the ecclesiastical domination and rank conferred by territorial endowment, that the Church of England demands at the hands of the State. Hence the refusal to acknowledge the equal claims of even the Church of Scotland. Mr. Bettridge contends, that 'the *powers* and *privileges* of an Established church in the province of Upper Canada,' are to be considered as 'a preference belonging ONLY to the Protestant Church of

* Mr. B. makes the present population of the country amount to 503,554, and claims one-half for the Church of England.

‘England.’ At present, Mr. Bettridge complains, ‘the Church has to endure all the reproach and odium, while she possesses none of the advantages of an Establishment in the colony.’ Why then does she court the odium of an Establishment, by litigating for a corporate monopoly originally unjust and practically of no benefit, and which, being created by one unwise act of legislation, may surely be repealed by the same authority?

The clergy reserves, the great bone of contention, have never to the present moment yielded an available revenue. From the Report of the Select Committee of the Commons in 1827, it appears that, while the nominal rent was £930 per annum, the actual receipt, for the average of the last three years, was only £50 per annum; and the Committee ‘see little reason to hope that the annual income to be derived from this source is likely, within any time to which they can look forward, to amount to a sufficient sum to provide for the Protestant clergy of these provinces.’ Considering the reservation of these lands in mortmain as a serious obstacle to the improvement of the colony, they therefore recommend the permanent alienation of them. In the year 1831, a Bill in accordance with this recommendation passed the House of Assembly of Upper Canada; but it was rejected by the Legislative Council, who addressed the Crown upon the subject; and thus the two branches of the provincial legislature were brought into collision. In the beginning of the following year, the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir J. Colborne, sent a message, by royal command, to the legislature of Upper Canada in respect to these lands; in which it was intimated, that his Majesty had anxiously considered how far such an appropriation of territory was conducive either to the temporal welfare of the ministers of religion in that province, or to their spiritual influence; and that, as the result of such inquiries, his Majesty had found that the *changes sought for by so large a proportion of the inhabitants of the province*, might be carried into effect without sacrificing the just claims of the Established Churches of England and Scotland. The waste lands set apart as a provision for the clergy of these venerable bodies, had hitherto yielded no disposable revenue; and the period at which they might reasonably be expected to become more productive, was still remote. Before the arrival of that period, his Majesty entertained the hope that it might be found practicable to afford the clergy of those churches such a reasonable and moderate provision as may be necessary for enabling them properly to discharge their sacred functions. His Majesty, therefore, invited the House of Assembly to consider how this part of the provisions of the Constitutional Act might be most advantageously called into exercise. In pursuance of this message, the Attorney-General of the province introduced a Bill re-investing the remaining clergy reserves in the Crown; but no

discussion of it took place. In the following year (1833), the Bill was again brought forward, and read a first time; but no further procedure was taken. In the following session, a division took place upon it in the House of Assembly. In 1835, a fresh Bill was brought in and carried through the House, authorizing the sale of the whole remainder of the clergy reserves, and the application of the proceeds to the furtherance of education in the province. The Legislative Council, 'as usual, remained firm in their *defence of the church*,' and rejected the measure.

In the mean time, it appears that, by direction of the Earl of Ripon while Colonial Secretary, the Governor, Sir J. Colborne, would have proceeded to erect and endow rectories or parsonages, according to the dormant provisions of the Act of 1791, had not the exorbitant claims of the Tory party in the council prevented the accomplishment of their object.

'The Governor and the Attorney General (Mr. Jameson) were of opinion that the rectories should be confined to the limits of the church and church-yard; that is, that the spiritual jurisdiction of the rector or parson should not necessarily extend further than those narrow limits. It would, consequently, depend on each individual of a township, to admit or reject the spiritual oversight of the rector of the Church of England. This plan was deemed expedient and advisable, in order to meet the objections which might be advanced by any body of Christians dissenting from the church, that the clergy possessed rights which might be interpreted as interfering with the liberty of other denominations. It was also thought expedient thus to limit the boundaries of the rectories, in order to avoid the plea which the enemies of the church might make, that the clergy, in process of time, would demand tithes from the people: thus limited, their demands could reach no farther than the precincts of the sanctuary. This plan, which appeared best calculated to remove any reasonable ground of objection, was strenuously opposed by the Executive Council; (or some members of it;) and their opposition was sanctioned or supported by the opinion of the Solicitor-General (Mr. Hagerman). The plan proposed by the Executive was, that the rectors should enjoy the same privileges, and exercise the same spiritual jurisdiction over a township or parish, which a rector or vicar of a parish claims in England. The Lieutenant-Governor could not assent to the adoption of this plan; the consequence was natural—neither party giving way, the church was deprived of the advantage which the instructions from home and the disposition of the Governor entitled her to expect. It is not improbable, that, had Sir John Colborne remained in the administration of the government, the affairs of the church might have still continued in this unsatisfactory state. His recall, however, having been signified to him, and through him to the council, it appears the council felt the propriety of yielding to the Governor's proposed plan, rather than risk, perhaps, the endowments altogether, by awaiting the decision of a new Governor, armed with fresh and, possibly, less friendly instructions.

Literally at the eleventh hour, the patents for the institution of fifty-seven rectories were prepared and passed the great seal of the province. Such an *apparently* sudden measure was calculated at any time to attract attention, but more especially so on the eve of the resignation of the Lieutenant-Governor. The newspapers of the province, whose disaffection to the church had been unhesitatingly avowed, teemed with bitter and vituperative attacks on the Governor. Some vital principle of the monarchy might have been sacrificed to the arbitrary caprice of the Governor;—whereas one of the plainest requirements of the constitution had merely been carried out into execution. It was indeed, the simple issuing of the patents which was then effected; for all the lands, thus deeded, had been long set apart as glebes, and, in many cases, been in possession of the clergy for years. In a short time the feverish excitement abated, till another opportunity was afforded for kindling it into fresh vigour.'—*Bettridge*, pp. 53—55.

Scarcely had Sir F. B. Head assumed the government of the province, than, with his characteristic rashness, he urged the legislature to enter immediately upon the consideration of this agitating question.

'It might perhaps have been better,' says Mr. Bettridge, 'to have allowed the ebullition of feelings excited by the late endowments to subside into peace, before the question of the reserves had been agitated. Time might have softened down much of the bitterness which the adversaries of the church exhibited in the discussion. A Committee was appointed, and, doubtless, after very anxious and laborious investigation, they brought up (but did not agree on) a report; at all events, the chairman (Mr. Draper) declared himself dissatisfied with it: and well he might; for the majority of this Committee of five, recommended, not indeed, an alienation of the reserves from religious uses, but a division of them. The reader will doubtless be anxious to learn what sections of Christians were to be favoured. The first was the Church of England. Second, the Church of Scotland! Third, the Methodists!! Fourth, the Baptists!!! And fifth, (proh pudor!) the Church of Rome!!!! The report was ordered to be printed, but no discussion was attempted during a considerable portion of the session. At length the Solicitor-General, (Mr. Hagerman,) whose devotion to the welfare of the church has conciliated the esteem and respect of her members, delivered his opinions with such energy and eloquence on the character and provisions of the proposed measure, that the enemies of the Establishment burst forth into the most violent abuse of the church, her ministers, her ordinances, and her friends. It is with unfeigned grief we are obliged to record the fact, that the Church of Scotland was not exceeded (if equalled) by any, in bitterness of spirit and language; the virulence of the assault cannot be qualified by the charitable epithet of *sectarian*; it was *un-christian*. The subject of the fifty-seven rectories was again revived; and remonstrances, couched in no measured terms, were forwarded to

the Imperial, as well as to the Colonial Government. A deputy from the Church of Scotland was sent over to England. What he may have effected either against our church, or in favour of his own, rests amongst the arcana of the Colonial office. One effect of the representations against the church was, that Lord Glenelg submitted the case of the fifty-seven rectories to the consideration of the law officers of the crown. It had been boldly asserted that the patents were invalid and illegal, because, it was pretended, the royal sanction had not been given to the Lieutenant-Governor for such a procedure. It was, perhaps, the easiest way of giving a kind of immediate satisfaction to the complainants, however the charge of partiality and inconsiderate haste in bringing, at best, but an *imperfect case* before the crown officers, may attach to the Colonial minister. The enemies of the church were permitted, for awhile, to exult; for the opinion of the law officers thus obtained, distinctly declared the patents to be invalid and illegal, because no authority had been given to the Governor to issue them. The triumph was short. The deficiency in the archives of the Colonial Office was supplied from the better guarded offices of the provincial government:—the authority was found duly registered:—the law officers consequently were obliged to withdraw their opinion, and the church has been allowed silently to enjoy her assailed right.

Ib., pp. 55—57.

Such is our Author's account of the termination of the affair. According to his own showing, the sudden issuing of the patents for the institution of the fifty-seven rectories, on the eve of the resignation of the Lieutenant-Governor, was a transaction which reflects no honour upon any of the parties concerned; and it justly excited the indignation of the colonists. It appears that the authority to issue them had been given under the administration of Earl Grey, some time between 1830 and 1833; and the Lieutenant-Governor must have been aware that, without fresh instructions from the existing Government, he was acting in a very questionable manner. But he seems to have felt compelled to consent to the measure when, 'at the eleventh hour,' the Executive Council artfully lowered their demand; and the chief merit of the tricky stroke of policy is probably due to the little Tory junto.

With regard to the professed division of the clergy reserves, Mr. Bettridge assumes, that, because 'no disclaimer of concurrence on the part of the voluntaries was heard,' the Dissenters would doubtless, 'as good and obedient subjects,' have passively endured and submitted to it. One of his reasons for this calumnious assumption will excite a smile; it is, that he 'as a churchman, finds it difficult to imagine how any well informed man can seriously and sincerely advocate the voluntary system.' Another reason has more weight in it, if it be indeed 'notorious fact, that the Dissenters have received, and are yearly receiving, money grants from the Government to a greater amount than the value

‘of the fifty-seven rectories.’ If any such Dissenters raise their voices against the endowments of the Church of England, they are very inconsistent, and entirely deserve Mr. Bettridge’s severest censures. But we must have proof of the fact, before we can give credit to the statement. It is possible that, under the name of ‘Dissenters,’ he means to include as well ministers of the Church of Scotland as of the Church of Rome, and some who are, in truth, decided anti-voluntaries. This would not be very ingenuous on his part, but it would be quite as fair as his attempt to identify the opponents of the arrogant and exclusive pretensions of the Episcopal clergy with those who have taken part in the late revolt, and ‘whose names are branded as rebels to the ‘sovereign.’

And this reminds us of a little incident which took place since the suppression of the revolt. It had pleased Sir Francis Bond Head and his Executive Council, to issue a proclamation in the Queen’s name, commanding a day of public thanksgiving to be observed throughout the province, on the 6th day of February, in acknowledgment of their deliverance ‘from the dangers and ‘calamities of the unnatural insurrection and rebellion:’ which proclamation concluded in these extraordinary terms: ‘And we ‘do *strictly charge and command*, that the said day of public ‘thanksgiving be reverently and devoutly observed by all our ‘loving subjects in our said province of Upper Canada, *as they ‘tender the favour of Almighty God, and would avoid his wrath ‘and indignation, and upon pain of such punishment as WE may ‘justly inflict on all such as contemn or neglect the performance of ‘so religious and necessary a duty.*’ The Rev. Mr. Roaf, the Congregational minister of Toronto, who, as a wise and faithful Christian minister, had forborne to take any part in the political proceedings, felt that he could not in conscience submit to so extraordinary a stretch of ecclesiastical supremacy; and he addressed a letter to the Editor of ‘The Palladium,’ explaining, in temperate and respectful terms, his reasons for publicly refusing obedience to the edict. ‘The proclamation requires,’ says Mr. Roaf, ‘that the said day be reverently and devoutly observed as we ‘tender the favour of Almighty God, &c. I cannot for a moment ‘admit the promise of God’s favour, and threat of his wrath and ‘indignation, by a human being, and a mere political officer. If, ‘too, earthly rulers may, according to their own views, select ‘days of religious observance, and command our compliance, it ‘would be right in a Roman Catholic king or governor to appoint the fasts and festivals of his church, and conformity would ‘be our duty. Hence, the necessity of keeping spiritual and ‘civil jurisdiction distinct. To avoid an apparent concession to ‘spiritual assumption, I must disregard the present proclamation.’ This letter, as might be expected, drew down upon Mr. Roaf

misrepresentation and invective. He replied with mildness; explaining the grounds of his protest. He acknowledged that his Excellency did well in proposing to the community a day for general observance; but the command and threats made an immense difference in the case. From the following paragraphs it will be seen, that, if there are in the province some Dissenters open to Mr. Bettridge's imputation of interested servility, there are others better informed and better principled, who are incapable of selling their birth-right for 'a few acres of wild land.'

'The outburst of ecclesiastical servility, occasioned by my letter, shows a present imminent danger to religious liberty, that dearest right of man; so also does the attempted punishment of myself, for daring to act as a watchman of Zion, in the quartering of six militia men upon my family—the very means employed by the French Papists to break the spirit of the Protestant clergy after the revocation of the edict of Nantes. However, I can once for all tell my uproarious abusers, lay and clerical, that with secular politics I will have nothing to do; but if they mean to prevent my maintaining the full rights of conscience, they must not resort to obloquy or annoyances, or clamour, or bribery, —they must take my person.*

* * * *

'We (Congregationalists) consider it to be a duty of kings and rulers 'to promote the public good, both civil and religious, by all such means as are not subversive of public and private right;'—but we consider, too, that national religious establishments *are* subversive of civil liberty and corrupting to religion, prevent public freedom, and crush a private right of judgment. I am told 'that a general mockery of religion and God has been quite as much the result of sectarian fanaticism as of state-religiousness.' Well then, let us have neither the state-religiousness nor the sectarian fanaticism. This latter evil is a curse, whether in an established sect or an unestablished. That much fanaticism was exhibited during the commonwealth is true, and so was much religion; and wherever a religious spirit is general and active, there will be much that is spurious as well as much that is genuine; just as a trading community will contain many crafty speculators, and much liberty will be attended with some licentiousness. There are checks which nature and Providence soon bring to act upon fanaticism; and if, instead of leaving it to these checks, we employ an established church, we shall extinguish religion itself, with perhaps its counterfeit.

* After the publication of his former letter, the municipal authorities quartered six soldiers upon him, and upon none of his neighbours. Having the alternative of submitting to a small fine, he refused to receive the soldiers, and was immediately plundered of furniture to four times the amount of the fine. In a letter dated March 15, he says: 'I took all without saying a word; and the parties have become ashamed of their conduct, and are about sending my furniture back again. The principle contained in my two letters is said to be *now* admitted almost universally in the city, and I hope a great object has been advanced.'

David Hume, the deist, advocated national religious establishments upon the ground that they checked excessive religion—and we know that any religion was with him excessive. — When the Episcopal church was re-established at the Restoration, it immediately brought in the lethargy in religion and licentiousness in morals, which disgraced the reign of Charles II. As for the French revolution, an established church had previously rendered religion despised and hated. The English Dissenters are blamed for joining in political proceedings with infidels, &c. &c.; but the establishment robs and degrades all that do not belong to it, and all are driven into one common attitude of defence. And if some general resistance be not adopted *here*, the tyrant-church will seize the public property, lift up her mitred front in courts and parliaments, and the despotism of the English villages will be spread o'er all the land. But why do church people blame us Dissenters for coalescing with men with whom they themselves unite in supporting the church by tithes and church-rates, and whom they are obliged to admit to the sacrament, whenever required. The church publications were lately clamorous in their denunciations of the recent appointment of *infidels* to *professorships* and *bishoprics*, and yet all are going on together in the church. Some men (like Dr. Paley) cannot afford to keep a good conscience. We love much of the spiritual part of the Episcopal church, but are driven from her *secular* establishment: we say, 'take away her battlements, for they are not the Lord's.' — *Second Report of the Colonial Missionary Society, Appendix*, pp. 35, 36.

The conduct of Sir Francis B. Head and his advisers is the more reprehensible, as they must have known that such a proclamation would not have been submitted to even by the Church of Scotland; and that, in fact, it could have had no force out of the pale of the Established Church. And the mean and dastardly attempt to punish Mr. Roaf for the conscientious discharge of his religious duty in this instance, speaks loudly as to the spirit of the Tory party who claim all the loyalty of the province; but who have, in fact, been mainly instrumental in inflaming those deeply rooted discontents, of which a few seditious adventurers endeavoured to avail themselves in planting the standard of republicanism. As Mr. Bettridge has attempted to cast a stigma upon his ecclesiastical opponents, without very distinctly defining them, we think it right to insert the following extract from the Second Report of the Colonial Missionary Society.

'Our brethren will naturally feel anxiety to be distinctly informed what have been the results, as affecting our missionaries, and their flocks and labours, in those provinces, of the late insurrection in the Canadas. For a time, of course, the prevalence of confusion, alarm, and exasperated feelings, could not be otherwise than very afflictive to our brethren, and most injurious to their labours of peace and love. The brethren at Toronto, Hamilton, Westminster, Burford, and Kingston, appear to have been most exposed to the consequences of

the conflict raging around them. But it is a very happy consideration, calling for much gratitude to God, and greatly strengthening confidence in the wisdom and piety of our beloved brethren, that not one of them, nor a single member of their churches, was in the least degree involved in the proceedings of the rebels; not even, with one or two doubtful exceptions, any of those connected with your missionaries, by attendance on their ministry. Mr. Roaf writes, under date of the fifteenth of March: 'I hope that our political distresses are now over, and it gives me pleasure to say that all our ministerial brethren, and their families, are unharmed as to their persons, and, what is more important, as to their characters. They have felt the general dangers, have been distressed by the spectacles of violence and suffering around, and have, in one or two instances, been rudely treated. But while several humble Baptist ministers have been subjected to indignities and cruelties, our more immediate brethren have all been happily exempted from such violence. This we owe, perhaps, to our being comparatively new residents; but, with one exception, I think we have avoided giving offence to either of the political parties.'

'Both Mr. Roaf and Mr. Wilkes, in their various communications, allude to the fact, which is, indeed, what might be naturally anticipated, that, our body being well known to entertain liberal opinions on all subjects relating to liberty, religion, and education, when some in the colonies who push those sentiments to dangerous and violent extremes broke out into actual rebellion, odium and suspicion fell on our friends as holding, though in a just and moderate form, the same general views with the insurgents. This state of public feeling could not, for a while, be otherwise than injurious. But, then, it was sure to be but temporary in its influence; and Mr. Wilkes already writes under date of the 26th of March, 'The wide difference between reformers and rebels, to which excitement had blinded the multitude, is beginning to stand out to general observation most prominently.'

'Their correspondents also express a confidence, in which your committee entirely concur, that the 'things which have happened' in Canada, will 'fall out to the furtherance of the gospel' there. The true state of things in those provinces will now be ascertained—real grievances will be redressed—the decided attachment of the great majority of the inhabitants to the connexion of those colonies with the parent country, has been made most apparent—the pressing and urgent want of religious ordinances among the people, will be more powerfully felt by themselves, and more clearly seen in this country; and your committee will now feel more confidence and satisfaction in sending out brethren to labour in the Canadas, after the real state of things, there, has thus become apparent, than before the revolt, when affairs were suspicious, threatening, and ill understood. May God dispose the hearts of many faithful labourers to go forth with holy zeal and courage to a country where they are so greatly needed!'—*ib.*, pp. 22, 23.

It is impossible to estimate too highly the beneficial agency of this important Society in the present state of the colony. Annual Reports are, we fear, too generally thrown aside as waste paper;

but we earnestly hope that this document will obtain attention, and be the means of promoting among all Protestant denominations a more strenuous effort to promote evangelical religion in the British colonies.

To return to Mr. Bettridge. In the second part of his pamphlet, he details the proceedings of the 'Deputation from the Church in Upper Canada,' consisting of himself and the Rev. Benjamin Cronyn, who arrived in this country in the spring of last year. It appears that, in consequence of the withdrawal of the annual parliamentary grant of £15,000 in 1832, the Society for Propagating the Gospel had deemed itself obliged to reduce its missionary establishments; but, 'by an arrangement made with Government, the Society was relieved altogether of the demand for the salaries of its missionaries.' Since then, the Society had done nothing for Upper Canada, except making a grant of £500 per annum. The late Bishop of Quebec and the Bishop of Montreal urged upon the Society to allow a distinct fund to be collected for Upper Canada; but their application was unsuccessful, the Committee withholding their assent on the ground that such an exception might be successively required for all the colonies. In consequence of this resolution, in May 1837, a new Society was formed, under the patronage of the Bishop of Quebec, entitled, 'The Upper Canada Clergy Society for sending out Clergymen, &c., to that Province.' This was a very proper step,—one that the friends to the voluntary principle and to the missionary principle cannot but cordially approve of. We have only to regret that Mr. Bettridge, though he succeeded in obtaining liberal contributions from the British public, should have been so ill satisfied with the formation of this new Society, and so little confident of its proving effective, as to persist in importuning the colonial office for parliamentary grants and government patronage, notwithstanding the sore discouragement he received from Sir George Grey on his first application. 'In answer to our plea for effectual, and *perhaps a little more exclusive* assistance,' he says, 'Sir George attempted to weaken our claim by the observation, that *we were but the sect of a minority.*' 'A pious churchman, high in office, thus designating the Established Church of these realms *a sect*, gave us but indifferent earnest of success with the powers that be.' We can conceive of the ecstasy of surprise and horror into which a full-bred-church-of-England-man must have been thrown by this word. 'Oh that I should have lived,' said a right honourable person of this class, 'to hear the Church of England termed *a sect*, by a minister of the crown!' Yet, what is the Church of England in Scotland but a Dissenting sect, and, as in Canada, the sect of a minority? To Mr. Bettridge's persevering applications, in the shape of letters and a memorial to the crown, Lord Glenelg returned an

answer, in which 'his Lordship deprecates the system which would 'leave the ministers of religion dependent on the precarious support of their several congregations;' and expresses his opinion, 'that the permanent appropriation of funds sufficient for their 'decent maintenance is to be classed among the highest and first 'objects of national policy,' but 'there are only four sources from 'which it is possible the demand can be satisfied:—

1. From the public revenue of Great Britain. 'Lord Glenelg 'is of opinion that the House of Commons would not regard this 'as a legitimate use of the revenue of the United Kingdom.*

2. From the unsettled lands of the crown in Upper Canada. The disposal of these is now in the hands of the colonial legislature.

3. The clergy reserves. The Constitutional Act gives the colonial legislature the power to appropriate them.

4. The public revenue of the province. 'His Lordship does 'not venture to anticipate what course the House of Assembly 'may think proper to pursue.'

In his reply to Lord Glenelg, Mr. Bettridge, well knowing what course the provincial legislature is likely to adopt, urges that the question as to the reserves never will or can be settled within the province, and calls for the peremptory interference of parliament. 'Your Lordship,' he says, 'will, I trust, 'excuse me for saying, that Her Majesty's Government would, by 'an adherence to their present policy, prove *a greater enemy to the 'Church of England than even the revolted States of America*: they 'did respect a grant, an endowment made by Queen Anne to the 'church in the State of New York.' This language does not appear to have alarmed his Lordship, who seems to have rightly appreciated the alternate coaxing and threatening of the clerical deputy, and to have maintained a mild and dignified firmness. Elsewhere Mr. Bettridge declares, that he 'knows not a clergy-' 'man in Upper Canada, who, if his personal feelings alone were 'concerned, would not prefer that the provision of the clergy 'reserves had never been made, than that, being made, but not 'effectually secured, they should furnish a *constant subject of 'bitterness and animosity among the people*, and most unchristian 'attacks upon the church.' And yet they are stickling and quarrelling for the unprofitable possession! But this not all. A

* The following note, however, shows that the House of Commons, has its moments of easy temper, and requires watching. 'I am happy, indeed,' says Mr. B., 'to have it in my power to publish the fact, that Her Majesty's Government have been induced to ask (*successfully of course*) the imperial parliament for an annual grant of £1000 for the Bishop of Montreal. Can there be a doubt that the parliament would also grant a sufficient supply for the church in Upper Canada, if his Majesty's government would be prevailed on only to ask?'

bishop for the Upper Province is sought for; and Lord Glenelg is asked, 'whether, if means should be provided from private resources, for the decent support of a bishop for the province of Upper Canada *in his episcopal dignity*, Her Majesty's Government would issue the royal mandate required by the constitution of the church for carrying such constitution into effect.' The answer returned is that, 'Her Majesty's Government would be perfectly ready to sanction the erection of a separate diocese limited to the Upper Province, if such a sanction were distinctly understood as not implying any pledge on their part to provide the funds necessary for the maintenance of the bishop.' The primate, however, will have nothing to do with the measure on such conditions. The following extract is given from his reply to Mr. Bettridge.

'My consent to such a measure would involve the abandonment of a principle which I shall always maintain; that it is the duty of the state, by endowment or some other way, to make provision for the due administration of church discipline and the spiritual instruction of its subjects.'

'Is there,' subjoins Mr. Bettridge, 'a churchman who can refuse his hearty Amen to the principle thus *forcibly exhibited* by the head of the church?' With Mr. Bettridge's leave, His Grace is not the head of his church, but Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria, Defender of the Faith. As there are two Established churches in these realms, what, upon even the above principle, is to prevent the State, in making such 'due provision,' from preferring to set up the cheaper Establishment of the two, which would save the cost of lord bishop and all the cumbrous appendages of prelacy?

So, we presume, stands the matter at present. We trust that we have not exhausted the patience of our readers by going into these details, which we think important as illustrating two points: first, the absolute incompatibility of the claims of the Church of England with sound and just principles of civil government; and secondly, the schismatical character of those haughty pretensions which separate the Church of England from every other Protestant communion. What a scourge and pest has prelacy been to the church in every age! We do not say, episcopacy, for, in some Protestant churches, that form of church polity assumes a primitive simplicity and modest dignity which render it at least inoffensive. But the Church of England is not satisfied with having bishops; they must be *lord*-bishops. The mitre must be emblazoned upon the crimson cushion which receives the foot of even colonial prelacy. How excellent and amiable soever the individual, the mitre transforms him into a political priest, lording it over God's heritage: his diocese is his realm, his brother clergy his subjects, and the ministers of Christ of every

other church, Lutheran or Reformed, Presbyterian or Congregational, are regarded as intruders and aliens. Transplanted into our distant settlements, this bastard popery every where becomes an element of social discord, and a mischievous obstruction to the religious efforts of all other denominations not bearing its mark. Compared with any other ecclesiastical body, how feeble are its moral efforts! How incapable is the Established Church, as she calls herself, of keeping pace, without the aid of the State, with the spontaneous and disinterested exertions of other denominations! Hence, her voluntary movements are convulsive, and are always followed by collapse. No wonder that she abhors the voluntary principle, for that would never furnish £180,000 a year for six and twenty overgrown clergymen, while £10,000 a year cannot be extracted out of the entire wealth of the hierarchy, with all its titled and landed supporters among the laity, to supply ministers for a destitute colony. The Gospel Propagation Society, having at its command the immense resources of the Church of England, can spare only £500 a year for Upper Canada; 'not, of course, from any want of will, but solely and 'absolutely from want of means!' The Colonial Missionary Society in connexion with the Congregational denomination, formed only the other day, already devotes between two and three thousand a year to the maintenance of ministers in our Canadian and Australian colonies! Yet, can there be a doubt that Episcopalians would vie with other denominations in zealous exertions, if they were not wedded to a false system, and withheld from doing their duty by being taught to devolve it upon the State? By degrees, however, even Church of England men are learning, though more out of strife and contention than from good will, to practise the Gospel mode of supporting the institutions of the Gospel, and to try the efficacy of a principle which they distrust and protest against on every occasion on which they have recourse to it. The State, too, while solemnly deprecating the adoption of the voluntary principle, is perforce teaching the reluctant church to make experiment of its efficacy. Nervous folk brought up in the lap of luxury, never know what they can do by their own exertion, till they try. In due time it will no doubt be discovered, that church establishments are a political blunder; that the existing generation is fully competent to sustain the entire charge of providing for its own spiritual wants, without either drawing upon the piety or fanaticism of a former age in the shape of endowments, or taxing by anticipation the industry of those who are to come after us; and that even tithes and clergy reserves, royal bounties and parliamentary grants, afford a more precarious support to the faithful pastors and teachers of Christ's flock than the free contributions of those who have been taught to regard it as a principle of their religion, that 'the labourer is worthy of his hire.'

Art. II. 1. *China: its State and Prospects.* By W. H. MEDHURST, of the London Missionary Society. 8vo. London: Snow, 1838.

2. *China Opened; or a Display of the Topography, History, Customs, Manners, Arts, Manufactures, Commerce, Literature, Religion, Jurisprudence, &c., of the Chinese Empire.* By the Rev. CHARLES GUTZLAFF. Revised by the Rev. ANDREW REED, D.D. 2 vols. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1838.

CHINA has always appeared to us one of the most difficult pages in the volume of human nature, though so far as it is at all intelligible, it is decidedly one of the most interesting. In examining the social or moral condition of any one of the other tribes of mankind, we find for the most part that if but one feature of the character of a people be clearly developed, the others can be infallibly determined by the attentive observer of national physiognomy, and that the parts thus combined will present a portraiture distinct, well-proportioned, and natural: but the elements of the Chinese character are an aggregate of anomalies. We behold here an accumulation of heterogeneous qualities fortuitously gathered together and preserved in one mass, not by the force of a living principle uniting and enlivening the system, but by the mere absence of that internal energy which in a healthful body would throw off an adventitious particle from its surface. Begin at what point we please in the literary and scientific state of China, and we are struck at once with this chilly feeling of insularity—we are standing, so to speak, on a rock in the midst of a vast ocean, and at a distance, so great as almost to preclude the possibility of sight, stands the very next accessible point of land. Suppose our examination of the literary statistics of China commence at that point, which is conceived in the history of all other nations to have led to an almost necessary elevation of their intellectual and moral character, we allude to printing, an art which China is known to have practised when the nations of Europe were buried in the profoundest darkness. We may admire, and we cannot but admire the ingenuity of a people who at so early a period came into the possession of a principle containing so much power on the formation of mind, but there we rest. In vain we seek in the neighbouring and connected sciences of grammar, rhetoric, criticism, for those results which our knowledge of the history of European literature has taught us to expect. In Europe the discovery of printing has exercised an almost omnipotent agency in every department of learning: in China printing has been a block to science. With us the press has been a living principle; it has not only produced books but men: in China the press has stereotyped the clumsy

awkwardness of the first attempt at thinking. As far as regards the merely mechanical act, printing does not appear to have advanced in China beyond the rudeness of its primitive form; and in respect to its influence on mind, it appears rather to have impeded than facilitated the progress of thinking. The oral language of the celestial empire has remained for many centuries totally uninfluenced by this art, and whilst amongst the tribes of Celtic or Teutonic origin, printing has in a comparatively short space of time banished the harsh gutturals of a rude and unsocial barbarism, the choaking and scarcely articulated monosyllables of these tongue-tied ventriloquists remain in their original inflexibility and rigidity. In vain you seek in the classic productions of her literati for those nice distinctions of thought, those delicate shades of expression, those felicitous coruscations of a creative fancy, which, if they have not been altogether produced, yet have certainly been matured by the fostering care of this auxiliary of literature in Europe. The literature of China owes nothing to printing beyond mere preservation, and the object preserved is not the living being, but rather the dried and withered material of the naturalist's cabinet, without vitality in itself, and consequently without the power of begetting life in others. What has been said in the earliest period of Chinese literature is therefore all that must be said; to advance beyond it requires a new system of symbols, and the man who should be so hardy as to venture one idea not included within the limits of literary orthodoxy, would unsettle the whole system of Chinese philosophy, and would alone succeed in his attempt by introducing a new alphabet of learning.

Or take another point from which we may again begin our examination—let it be the discovery of the mariner's compass, or the power of gunpowder. These are ancient portions of Chinese knowledge; but the practical use of them is yet in its earliest infancy. We are constrained again to acknowledge the same want of continuity; again we are removed to an immense distance from any observable land-mark. Between us and any other *terra firma* of knowledge there is a very abyss of darkness, many dread chasms of loneliness, an expanse scarcely to be filled up even by thought. We cannot comprehend how to get from one promontory to the other. We may imagine ourselves as beholding the wreck of a nation; some great catastrophe of nature has submerged the body of the vessel, and left here and there the end of a mast,—a few insular and unconnected protruding eminences which now that the hull is no longer visible appear to have no correspondence with each other, and to have grown into their present shape by chance. We require the intervening spaces to be filled up, that we may comprehend the consistency of the arrangement.

It is thus in the whole orb of Chinese literature; we are

obliged to go through the whole in detail, the principle of analogy has here no place. The most deplorable ignorance stands in immediate juxtaposition with science of a more than ordinary elevation; an astonishing accuracy and minuteness of detail are often combined with a total want of general principles, or with principles fatally and hopelessly incorrect; here and there are observable foundations of immense mental strength on which no superstructures are erected, or perhaps some superstructures of so uncouth an appearance and of so fragile and useless a construction, as tend only to prove the perverted ingenuity of the artificers; and in another direction we are surprised with the prospect of a noble elevation and a magnificent portico, which seem to have sprung up from the ground without any perceptible agency sufficient to have reared the splendid edifice. All the intellectual combinations of China are monstrous. In the mental imagery of China their own dragon meets our eye at every step; there is in all its aspects a mixture of the wing that elevates towards a higher region, and the trailing carcase and the crawling extremity which drags its tortuous folds through the slime and the mud. In the point of its mingled character of civilization and barbarism, we might for a moment perhaps imagine that China resembles its great rival Hindostan, but there is a wide, a total difference. To an attentive observer of the state of this last mentioned country, it would appear as though the blighting and withering hand of the demon of barbarism had struck one death blow on all its social, intellectual, and scientific relations, in a moment when they were rapidly advancing towards the very climax of their perfection—you imagine you can hear the echo of the blow, and trace the very scar of the wound,—you see that from that fatal moment every thing has been stationary, the breathing of the mind has been suspended as in fearful expectation, and death has petrified them into their present immoveability: the line of separation between life and death is visible and defined, and appears to have been drawn with sudden and momentary precision. It is not so in China: the face of science here marks a violent and unequal disruption, the separation is not marked by an equal line; in some places the roots of science and the ground in which they grew are entirely plucked up, and in other parts the most elevated points of literature are yet standing in their legitimate altitude.

To account altogether for these incongruities in the mental character of China, is perhaps beyond the task of those who know so little of its ancient history as Europeans are generally constrained to be contented with, though we cannot but think that both its early acquaintance with those arts and sciences to which we have already adverted, and its observable ignorance of those which are needful to unite and consolidate them into one complete system, and to impart to each the perfection of which it is

capable, are to be attributed to the peculiar locality of the great empire. China is separated by natural boundaries from every other country excepting Tartary, and in that direction the barrenness of the soil and the usual inclemency of climate is generally a sufficient defence. By its peninsular situation the empire has therefore been preserved from the irruptions of foreign and barbarous nations, checking the progress of civilization and of science. The conquests of China by the Tartars cannot be considered as destructive of this principle, as those conquests were of a modern date, long subsequent to the invention of the arts, and in truth never affected the literature of the country. Placed, therefore, in a fertile soil, and enjoying a mild and genial climate, undisturbed by external war, and devoted to an agricultural and placid life, the Chinese were placed in circumstances more advantageous for the acquisition or the invention of the arts and sciences than perhaps any other nation, and these advantages they employed, and employed successfully.

The same peculiarity of the local situation of China may also account for the wide intervening spaces of sterility to be found between the few oases in its world of science. In Europe, experience has taught us that no one nation has ever been permitted to carry a discovery to the full limit of its perfection ! The inventions of England have been completed by the workmen of France and Germany ; and what the students of other countries have excogitated in the privacy of their closets, the artificers of England have perfected. The same observation extends also to the competition between the scientific men of the new world and the mother countries : it is by mutual communication, by the reciprocity of collision, that the spark kindled on one anvil, ignites in the hearth of another the matter previously prepared, and the darkness of ignorance is dispelled by the illumination of science. Now this communication has been utterly denied to the Chinese ; they have been from time immemorial *tabooed* from the rest of mankind, and no kindly intercourse has ever shaped their rude inventions into a form which made them suitable to mankind generally. All that they have done is specifically Chinese—like the uncouth figures on their porcelain, which are therefore representations of nothing in universal nature, because they are representations of objects in China. All the productions of this singular country have a character of their own, they are stiff, contracted, and incapable of being worked into any foreign composition : a whole vocabulary of monosyllables which defy all attempts to be made euphonous.

The authentic history of China carries us back to the most remote antiquity, though but little can be ascertained as to the line in which the patriarchs of that empire descended from the post-diluvian restorers of the human race. Known but partially even

to the neighbouring nations of the east, there is no evidence that her name was ever heard of by the Phœnician seaman, the Egyptian merchant, the Babylonian satrap, the philosophers of Greece, or the hardy veterans of Rome. The four mighty monarchies of the northern and western portions of the globe, arose from their obscurity, ran their sanguinary and miscalled glorious career, and sank again into the gloom of night, without once disturbing her tranquil repose. The whole history of the eternal city would scarcely occupy an observable parenthesis in a Chinese dynasty, and the haughty empress of the universe never triumphed over one captive subject of the celestial empire. Until the fourteenth century this mighty portion of the globe was entirely unknown to Europe; and from the works of the Catholic missionaries of the seventeenth century did this quarter of the world receive its first accredited information of the state of China. From that time until the commencement of the present century our acquaintance with China has advanced but slowly; and it may be fairly asserted that more has been accomplished within the space of the last twenty years in forming a link between us and the three hundred millions of human beings inhabiting that country, than in three preceding centuries. The Chinese dictionary of Dr. Morrison, the translation of the Bible into the same language, the several Chinese tracts which have been published by Christian Missionaries, and finally, the labours and publications of Gutzlaff and Medhurst, have begun, and are gradually prosecuting a work of unspeakable importance to that empire. The Christian philanthropist may look forward with assured confidence to the ultimate success of the moral machinery now in exercise for the benefit of China: the dissemination of religious knowledge in its purest form of scriptural instruction has a necessary connexion with moral improvement—a connexion established by the same omnipotence which gives validity to the laws of nature; and the ordinances of day and night shall sooner be violated than the influence of truth on the intellectual and religious state of mankind.

Mr. Medhurst, the author of the work now under consideration, is an Agent of the London Missionary Society, and has been engaged in his benevolent and arduous labours in various parts of the Malayan Archipelago since the year 1816. On his recent return to his native country for prosecuting some of the important objects of his mission, he was induced to collect the materials of the present publication, from a conviction that the claims of China on the benevolent and holy sympathies of British Christians have never yet been fully recognized. The volume is of a mixed character, embracing both a popular statistical view of many of the most interesting relations of China, and a journal of the labours of Mr. Medhurst and some of his excellent coadjutors,

in their endeavours to evangelize those natives of China and the Malayan Islands who came within the scope of their exertions. The volume is divided into twenty-two chapters, of each of which we shall give the title. Chapter I. is on the Chronology and Extent of the Chinese Empire. In this chapter there occur several admirable observations on the different degrees of authenticity of the fabulous and authentic eras of Chinese history. Here also we offer our tribute of thanks to Mr. Medhurst, for having pointed out a few very remarkable coincidences between some facts occurring in the accredited portion of its history and the statements of the Bible. We cannot but express our opinion that these are among the most important sections of the whole volume, and we earnestly wish that the Author had indulged us with more facts of a similar kind. It is particularly desirable to derive fresh proofs of biblical verity from that system of chronology and history which has formerly been considered as unfriendly to revelation. Chapters II. III. and IV. are on the Population of the Empire. In these chapters the Author supports the opinion which attributes the overwhelming mass of three hundred and sixty millions of human beings to this country; and he gives at least the air of probability to his view by an examination of several official documents on this subject. In the latter part of the Fourth Chapter there is a most affecting account of the evils occasioned to the native population by the importation and use of opium, and an appeal to the merchants and legislature of Great Britain against our traffic in this pernicious drug, which we can scarcely think will be heard in vain. It is indeed a heart-rending document, and is the voice of our brothers' blood crying in the ears of a God of retributive justice. Chapter V. is occupied with a View of the Civilization of the mighty empire, and with its Government and Laws; and Chapter VI. with its Language and Literature. In this last chapter we have much information on the nature of the oral language, the grammatical principles, and the written symbols of this extraordinary people, and a section of remarkable interest on the degrees of literary honour, and the rules by which those different degrees are bestowed. We have never seen in so small a compass so much information thrown together on the literature of the disciples of Confucius. Chapter VIII. treats of Religion, and describes the three great systems tolerated in the empire, that of Confucius, that of Taou, and Buddhism; or, in other words, the systems of Atheism, Superstition, and Pantheism. Chapter IX. is a History of the Catholic Missions in China, and is characterized by a spirit of tolerance and charity very creditable to the Author. Chapter X. embraces the Protestant Mission; and the same subject is continued in Chapters XI. XII. and XIII. Chapters XIV.—XIX. contain the journal of a voyage performed by the Author along

the east coast of the empire, as far northward as King-hae-chow. During the course of this voyage the Author landed at several parts of the coast, and distributed tracts explanatory of the Christian religion, and several portions of the Sacred Scriptures, in the Chinese language, to thousands of inquiring individuals. The journal is interesting in a very uncommon degree. Chapter XX. states the circumstances which followed that voyage. Chapters XXI. and XXII. conclude the whole book, with affecting appeals for more labourers in the missionary field, and with an account of their necessary qualifications.

The information contained in this volume is great, and the manner in which it is presented is, on the whole, judicious and suited to the subject. The style is generally plain, and lucid, though we must be permitted to say, that we have been constrained to wish that in some places it had maintained, if not a greater degree of dignity, yet at least a little more gravity. We must not be misunderstood as meaning that the Author is ever guilty of levity; no, far from it—but we should prefer in a book of acknowledged worth, and which might be made a standard work on the subject, to see nothing of that trite and common-place style of colloquial prettiness which, though it may render a book pleasant in the parlour, will rarely secure it a permanent place in the study. Might we adventure on another point of friendly criticism we should suggest that there is less of generalization and of extensive observation in the present work than we approve: the author is accurate enough in the statement of facts, and in the minuteness of circumstantial detail, whilst he displays but a small grasp in his philosophical conclusions; he is better in the topography than in the geography of the mental world, and gives more easily the elevation of a building than the map of an extensive territory. We offer these remarks in the kindest spirit, thanking Mr. Medhurst for what he has done, and has done so well, though we cannot but wish, such is our affection for him, that his work had approached nearer to perfection. There are also one or two remarks on some expressions in his work which we beg leave to make as, in case the Author should coincide with our opinion, he will have an opportunity of altering them in the event of another edition of his book. In p. 132, Mr. Medhurst in mentioning the opinion of the Edinburgh Review of Sir George Staunton's code of Chinese laws, says, 'These encomiums are certainly high, and the general laws of China are, undoubtedly, much indebted to their elegant translator, and still more lavish admirer.' Is this a compliment to Sir George Staunton's taste, or a satire on his faithfulness? Is the elegant translator, the same person as the lavish admirer? We suspect Mr. Medhurst has no intention to aver that they are the same, but we presume that his readers in general will under-

stand him as saying that the elegant translator and the lavish admirer are but one person. Finally, is it Mr. Medhurst's opinion that the encomium is too high, and that both the elegant translator, and the lavish admirer are wrong in their judgment? We wish these opinions were stated more clearly, and that if there be any charge intended, that charge were proved, or at least, endeavoured to be proved. In page 392 the Author observes, that in '1802 the English sent an armed force to take possession of 'Macao, in order to prevent its falling into the hands of the 'French; and in 1808 the attempt was renewed. In both cases, 'however, the Chinese resented the aggression, and stopped the 'trade, till the English troops had *disembarked*.' Surely the Author intended to say re-embarked, as the landing of the English troops on Chinese ground would be an extraordinary concession to Chinese authority—their departure on ship-board we can easily understand to be a concession. We shall not particularize others, though we have met with a few oversights of a similar kind, which we hope will be amended in a future edition. We must mention an unhappy sentence in page 43, where the practice of infanticide is said not to be *kept up*, in order to *keep down* population. The wood-cuts with which the volume is adorned are well executed, and happily chosen in order to give the reader a graphic portraiture of the more distinctive features of the country. We subjoin the following quotation as a specimen of the Author's general manner. It occurs in his reflections upon the almost incredible populousness of China.

'The Chinese are not only living under one form of despotic rule, they possess, likewise, one universal language and literature. It is a remarkable fact, that notwithstanding the spoken dialects of each province and county vary so considerably, that the Chinese of different districts are absolutely unintelligible to each other; yet, the written medium of the whole empire is easily understood by all, and writing instead of speaking, constitutes the universal method of changing ideas. The Chinese written language, being symbolical, and the same symbols being used to designate certain significations, whatever sounds be attached to the character, each instructed person readily understands a book though he may use a different dialect from the writer. It is remarkable farther that not only are the same signs employed for certain ideas, in all parts of the country, but the same style is used. The disposal of the characters, as well as the characters themselves, is according to one uniform method; so that a person able to write well in Chinese, no matter what may be his native dialect, is intelligible to the remotest borders of the empire. Yea, even beyond the limits of Chinese rule, the Chinese character and style are understood, and throughout Cochin China, Corea, and Japan, the same mode of writing is current and legible. Thus a book once composed in the customary Chinese style, if intelligible to one learned man, would be intelligible to all; and might travel among the hundreds of millions in-

habiting south-eastern Asia, communicating intelligence throughout the whole region. What a stimulus does this afford to an active and energetic mind, while engaged in studying the Chinese language, or inditing a book for their instruction, that he is doing what may be available to the benefit of so many millions, and that to the latest generation. Such a book needs only to be multiplied and circulated, without undergoing the slightest alteration, in order to enlighten and edify one-third of the human race.

‘The morals also, of this numerous people have one striking characteristic, and their religious views and practices are precisely similar throughout the empire. When a man has studied the main features of the Chinese character in one place and one person, he has studied them in all; and when he has discovered a train of argument that will silence the philosophical and superstitious objections of one individual, he has provided himself with materials that will be serviceable on all occasions. The uniformity and unvariableness of the Chinese mind is to be traced to their possessing one set of opinions on philosophy and religion; which being laid down in their ancient books, and stereotyped from age to age, constitutes the public and universal sentiment on the above topics, and runs through the whole mass of society. Hence the Missionary finds the Chinese always using the same argument, and starting the same objections, which having been often answered before, may be easily replied to again. In this view of the matter, the multiplicity of their population dwindles into insignificance, and affords an advantage to the missionary not to be met with elsewhere.’—pp. 78, 79.

The preceding pages were written, and in type, before Mr. Gutzlaff's volumes came to hand. This circumstance, with the extended notice we have recently taken of Chinese topics, in our review of Mr. Davis's work, must be our apology for the very brief reference we can make to the publication. We rejoice in its appearance, and fully concur with Dr. Reed in the opinion, that the volumes ‘make a valuable addition to our knowledge of ‘the Chinese empire and its dependencies.’ The work was wisely entrusted by Mr. Gutzlaff to the hands of Dr. Reed, who has exercised a discreet judgment in making such omissions as have brought it within its present reasonable dimensions. ‘It ‘could only be,’ he remarks, and we fully concur in the observation, ‘by extraordinary facility in the use of language, by unwearied labour in exploring its stores, by remarkable tact in assorting them, as well as by ready and extensive observations on ‘the people and the countries, that a work of such a character ‘could be produced. Viewing the ‘Celestial Empire’ from a different point of view from Mr. Davis, the author will be found to have supplied some of the deficiencies of his valuable work. The two publications, though embracing substantially the same topics, interfere very slightly with each other, and together with that of Mr. Medhurst, constitute an invaluable introduction to the history, literature, and religion, of the most singular people on the

face of the globe. Hitherto our knowledge of them has been scanty and vague, and few efforts have consequently been made for their instruction. The case is now different, and our responsibility is proportionably increased. We can no longer plead ignorance of their wants. Writers of undoubted credit and information,—the merchant and the christian missionary,—have removed the veil so long interposed; and the hundreds of millions inhabiting the Chinese empire, are now known to be sunk in the moral debasement and intellectual darkness, ever attendant on paganism. Will the efforts of the Christian church be proportioned to the magnitude of the field thus opened for its benevolent exertions? We wait to see what practical answer will be given to this inquiry.

Art. III. *A Discourse on the Complete Restoration of Man, morally and physically considered.* By DANIEL CHAPMAN. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.; and Knight, Leeds. 8vo.

IT is one of our *painful* duties to review this book. One of our *duties* we call it, because, whatever may be thought of an insulated volume, or with however quiescent a conscience a corps of reviewers may suffer it to pursue its way unnoticed to the trunk-maker's; when a gentleman commences authorship by the annunciation of three volumes in octavo on separate subjects, and threatens to spend his whole life in indefatigable endeavours to multiply the kind, it is due, both to the public and the author, to take some account of so remarkable a phenomenon, and to attempt some calculation of its probable portent. It is our *painful* duty, because we can say very little that is laudatory; and, whether our readers will give us credit for it or not, we are always sorry to be severe.

An advertisement at the close of the volume informs us, that the author has lately published, 'complete in one volume, 8vo., price 8s., A Dissertation practical and conciliatory, in three parts, intended to define, illustrate, and reconcile with each other, the following three classes of objects: 1. Philosophy and Theology; 2. Politics and Religion; 3. Private Opinion and Ecclesiastical Communion.' This is the first of a series. The other two, judging from the following joint title, which is set forth with elaborate typographical display, are 'par nobile fratrum.' 'A comprehensive Theological and Philosophical Dissertation on Man;' consisting of two regular and general Discourses, founded on two passages of the sacred volume, and designed to exhibit the triumph of reason and revelation in their conjoint elucidation of the following analogous, though perfectly distinct subjects of investigation: Discourse I. On the Complete Restoration of Man, morally and phy-

sically considered. Discourse 2. On the universal Establishment of the Human Race in a state of Perfect Civilization and Moral Culture :—the first of these discourses regarding chiefly the nature and character of the individual being, and the second, the circumstances and prospects of the entire human species. By Daniel Chapman.' Of these 'two discourses' the first is before us, and the second is 'ready for the press.'

It does not augur well for any production to be so pompously announced. Mr. Chapman, however, has not contented himself with blazoning this sort of matter on his title page, as our readers will further learn by a short extract from the 'Preface to Discourse First,' which the author thinks 'may not be unacceptable.'

'Greatly as the author admires and enjoys that light and easy style, which subjects of an ordinary or ephemeral kind innocently admit, or properly require ; he has, for the reasons already specified, studiously endeavoured to adopt a style strictly congenial in its character with the invariable and unparalleled importance, excellence, and comprehensiveness of the subjects which he has discussed. For the purpose of avoiding obscurity and preventing inaccurate or inadequate apprehension, he has had recourse to every process of definition, connexion, and expansion, that seemed likely to contribute to clearness, exactness, and completeness of conception. He consequently claims no indulgence on the score of conscious negligence or inadvertence ; since he has suffered no thought or expression to escape, without the closest and the strictest scrutiny, oft and rigorously repeated.

'He has written for futurity, he has written for eternity. His productions, like all other merely human compositions, must indeed eventually perish : their practical effects, however, he has endeavoured to render, so far as their circulation and operation shall extend, immediately and permanently beneficial.

'He conceives, therefore, he is authorized to take the liberty of suggesting, that this treatise should not merely be read, but studied—that it should not merely be consulted with a critical reference to the sentiment and style of the author, but with a direct, practical application to the conscience and character, the creed and practice of any individual for whose present and eternal benefit it has been no less benevolently designed, than—judging from the time and care expended in its composition—elaborately executed.'—pp. vii., viii.

We must draw upon our reader's patience for one brief extract more, which will complete the view taken by Mr. Chapman of his early literary 'achievements.'

'Without indulging in any illiberal, unfriendly, or invidious allusions, it may not be improper for the Author to observe, therefore, that he deems these publications peculiarly calculated to counteract the acknowledged infidelity and heterodoxy, so deplorably and extensively prevalent in the present age, and proportionately to facilitate the suc-

cess of all the truly evangelical institutions and philanthropic operations, in which, it must be confessed, the present age equally abounds.'—p. vi.

Other authors may, for aught we know, have delighted themselves with similar thoughts respecting their own works, before their publication; but we never met with any one with half the candour of Mr. Chapman. He absolutely thinks aloud. But let us enter the temple to which he has constructed so gorgeous a portico.

By 'the Restoration of Man, morally and physically considered,' he means the renovation of his mind, and the resurrection of his body, as provided for by 'Christianity.' With his sentiments on these subjects we do not materially quarrel, although we do not agree with all of them. He professes to tell us how they are contemplated, first, by reason, secondly, by infidelity; thirdly, by revelation. This is the plan of his book; to which, even if he had kept to it (which he has not), we should have objected, that the two former objects are utterly useless, and worse than useless. To tell us how infidels regard sacred truths can only tend to diffuse their sentiments, and, if our author had really done it, it would have infused an element of evil into his book; happily, however, he has not done it, but has filled up the space allotted to this threatened mischief, by a foolish, but more harmless abuse of infidels themselves, of which we shall give a sample presently. Then, to occupy two hundred and sixteen octavo pages, (more than half the volume) with telling us how unassisted 'reason' contemplates these glorious truths, can be deemed nothing better than solemn trifling. Nor is it, indeed, without an ill effect; since it tends to associate in our minds the perplexities and uncertainties of the unaided reasoner, with truths which in the light of revelation stand out in unquestionable authority and power. In the last portion of the work, which is the only one in which there could have been the least value, no justice is done to the theme. The author drags his reader, already wearied, over precisely the same grounds as in the first section, making no effective use of the sacred oracles, if not rather degrading them to the office of mere witnesses to what he professes to have found before, by a long 'process of ratiocination and deduction, successfully executed.' He talks of the bearing of what he has written on the 'conscience and the character, the creed and the practice;' but not an appeal to the conscience does he make throughout, nor an iota does he bring to bear upon the character. The entire practical amount of his labours is comprehended in the following sentence.

At the close of this discourse, in the execution of which we have not either consciously omitted or intentionally evaded any topic that naturally, essentially forms a part of such an investigation—we solemnly

declare it is our firm and unalterable conviction, that the revelation of God, and the reason of man, perfectly harmonize in that complete scheme of restoration, moral and physical, which Christianity constitutes. On this conviction we devoutly, inflexibly resolve to depend, and to act in all the infinitely momentous concerns of our own spiritual and eternal welfare ; and with intensest anxiety for the welfare of all others, we most importunately recommend their adoption and prosecution of the same course, as not incomparably superior to any other, but as the only course by which absolute and eternal perfection can be infallibly secured.'—pp. 417, 418.

The author has pleased himself with the belief, that his writings are '*peculiarly* calculated to correct the acknowledged infidelity' of the age. We thank him for his intention, which, in a Minister of the gospel (we know not of what communion), we may well believe to be an honest one. We must be permitted to tell him, however, that he over-rates his powers, if he does not altogether mistake them. Infidels could desire nothing better, than to see Christianity in the hands of such defenders, and themselves at the mercy of such assailants. We have already observed, that, in the portion of the volume in which the author had proposed to tell us what infidels think of the gospel, he tells us rather what he thinks of them. After ascribing their infidelity to various sources of evil, he thus expresses himself in relation to the melancholy subject of Satanic influence.

'So exact frequently is the coincidence which exists between these suggestions of Satan, and the spontaneous conceptions of the unbeliever, that the latter is rendered by this circumstance totally insensible of the infernal quarter from which the dreadful corroboration of his scepticism proceeds. He consequently becomes an unsuspecting easy prey to this pitiless, insatiable murderer of beguiled human souls. He mistakes the syren song of diabolically artful delusion, for the sweet music of melodiously chanting reason. He confounds duped submission to hellish imposture and domination with the rational assertion of moral freedom and independence.

'The devil is by no means chagrined at this fatal error of judgment, which the ignorance and pride of his vassals induce them to commit. He maliciously sacrifices all ambition of human praise, to the consummation of human destruction. The deeply experienced, infernal angler carefully conceals the line, until the bait of damnation is swallowed, and it is not until he finds his captured, struggling victim incapable of resistance or escape, that he fully discloses his fiendish form and devilish machinery, to the eyes of his then undeceived, but alas ! eternally ruined votary.'—pp. 232, 233.

We cannot say that we think this the way to convert an infidel, or to counteract infidelity. We can imagine nothing but a contemptuous smile, as an index of augmented obduracy, sitting on the brow of an unbeliever, while reading the four and thirty pages of abuse here discharged against him *on behalf of Christianity!*

One word we must say of our author's style. He describes it as *elaborate*, and it is so in the worst sense of the term. It has no simplicity, nor ease. All his paragraphs are men in buckram; and every sentence is so loaded with adjectives and adverbs, that the march can hardly proceed at all. The author is always in stilts, and sometimes we could imagine him taking the benefit of a balloon, from which, however, we hope he will never venture to descend in a parachute. Let our readers take a specimen.

'But who or what is that moving spectre, having eyes deeply mute yet dreadfully swollen and inflamed with excessive weeping, a forehead shrivelled into the wrinkles of premature age with extreme solicitude, hair dishevelled and bleached in comparative youth as by the tempests of a multitude of years, a countenance grown haggard and repulsive with anxiety, and cheeks ploughed into channels by ceaseless torrents of tears, lips drawn into convulsive contortions by the dire anguish that reigns in the soul, a breast heaving alternately with the deepest sighs and the heaviest groans, limbs paralyzed, and a frame writhing with indescribable and conflicting emotions of grief and melancholy, of rage and revenge, of madness and chagrin, of remorse and dread, of terror and horror of every description and degree? [Who is she, gentle reader?] Wouldst thou know her origin, her residence, her name? She is the offspring of depravity and crime. Thy breast is her habitation; and misery is her name.'—pp. 19, 20.

Poor misery! she has been a long while in the world, and has often been described; but we dare say she never thought of being made such a spectacle of as this. But seriously, it is necessary Mr. Chapman should know that this is not good writing, and that it will not make any impression upon the public mind. It is sheer bombast, and so is every page that he has written. If he continues to compose such stuff as this, he may 'write for futurity,' but the age is *very* distant that will know any thing of him. His notes will not only 'eventually perish,' but will perish very soon, and with very little profit to himself, or to any body else. We say these things the more pointedly, because the author professes the design of writing more books, and because we wish to save him from mortification and disappointment. We do not deny to him the possession of considerable power; but it is power as yet grievously misapplied. If he really desires to do any good, let him commence a new course. Let him tread over solid ground, instead of following *Jack o' the lantern* into bogs and marshes. Let him take a serious, practical aim, and write with simplicity, instead of accumulating a cumbrous weight and gorgeous pomp of words, and he may yet be of some service to the world; and may realize, perhaps, a little of that 'pecuniary advantage,' which, as he modestly informs us, he 'has *no objection* to share, proportionately 'with those to whom the typographical execution of his works may 'be entrusted.'

Art. IV. *Sermons; Preached at the Temple Church, and before the University of Cambridge, during the month of January, 1838.* By the Rev. THEYRE T. SMITH, M.A., Assistant Preacher at the Temple, and Sunday Evening Lecturer at St. Lawrence, Jewry. 8vo. London. Fellowes.

THIS is altogether an extraordinary volume. It is a long time since we have met with a book under the same title displaying so many of the higher qualities of excellence. In its style there is a matured manhood—a precision, dignity, and force, which remind us strongly of that class of divines to whom the scholars of the Church of England are accustomed to do homage, as to models that can hardly be surpassed. It exhibits much of the clearness and strength of Balguy and Horsley, with a deeper sensibility, and more warmth of imagination; and, in many parts, is the vehicle of a consecutive power of reasoning, that could not have come under the cognizance of those great men without exciting their admiration. It is allied, however, in the mind of our author, with a feeling of devotion, and a disposition to grapple with high theological themes, which did not belong to the character of Balguy; and with a manifest solicitude to discover and enforce practical truth, and a spirit of moderation and urbanity, of which Horsley knew nothing. In these respects the volume may be regarded as no unfair indication of the improved theology, and, we hope we may say, the improved temper, of that class of divines in the Church of England, who, without being counted evangelical, in the conventional meaning of that word, are concerned to inculcate the lessons of human duty on the grounds peculiar to revelation, and in the spirit of a devout seriousness.

We have some impression, however, that we ought to qualify the high praise which we can honestly bestow on the style and texture of this volume, when we call to mind that it is a volume of *sermons*. If there be any class of compositions that should be characterized more than another, by a strictly popular method of communicating instruction, and as relating to topics adapted to popular apprehension, sermons must constitute that class. The writer of leading articles in a newspaper does not indulge in nicely studied disquisitions on the questions of human policy. He addresses himself to all who can read, and is aware that a large portion of the community which he is desirous of influencing can do little more than read. There are books for disquisitions, and his business is to simplify the contents of such books, so as to adapt them to the working-day thoughts of the multitude about him. But the preacher has not only to address himself to those who can do little more than read, but to many who cannot

do that, and to a much greater number, who, though they can read, are disposed to look to the pulpit rather than the press, for their knowledge of the matters which the preacher professes to expound. Accordingly, one indispensable faculty of an efficient preacher would seem to be, the power of forming a just estimate of the average apprehension to which he has to address himself, and then of making things clear down to that level. What may be necessary to the complete and scholar-like discussion of a subject, considered simply as such, is one thing; but the manner in which it should be treated, considering the cast of mind to which you have to commend it, is another. No doubt, there are occasions when the highest order of ability may be very suitably put forth in the efforts of the pulpit; and if this be admissible any where, it must be in the case of a preacher 'at the Temple church, and before 'the University of Cambridge.' But these are exceptions. In general, that predominance of the reasoning faculty, and that elaborate perfectness of style, by which the volume before us is distinguished, are qualities much more in place with the learned when instructing the reading public from their study, than with the orator of the people, when addressing his Sunday auditory, with whom he must know a very little theological reading is made to go a great way, and upon whom all the refinements of finished composition are lost, or something worse. We believe that as men accumulate the lessons of experience in preaching, they become convinced that their real efficiency has been in proportion to their facility of uniting *plainness* with *force*. We speak of *force*, and we use the term in a large sense, because nothing can be more pitiable, in our judgment, than that loose talk on the common places of religion, in which some men have prided themselves, and which not a few have applauded as simple preaching! Truly one has met, among divines of this sort, with some choice specimens of the simple! Such men ought to know that to make the small vulgar, and to make the great intelligible, are not exactly the same thing.

But we must endeavour to make our readers more nearly acquainted with the discourses before us. The first is on 'The Expiatory Sacrifice of Christ,' in which the Socinian argument, that nothing more can be necessary, on the part of God, to the absolution of the guilty, than a simple announcement of forgiveness, is met with a novelty and force of conception which we think unanswerable. This reasoning, says the preacher,

'— though not a little plausible, is, we suspect, but ill considered and superficial. It overlooks this most important fact—that imperfect knowledge, or defective wisdom, is the principal, the only reason why human laws are made capable of yielding; and that the penalty of crime is not certain in its infliction. In all cases of remission or commutation of punishment, there is either some doubt of the crimi-

nality of the condemned person, or an opinion is entertained that the punishment impending over him is more than adequate to the offence of which he stands convicted. It is assumed or conjectured that there exists some valid ground for an acquittal from the charge of guilt, or for a mitigation of its penalty. In truth, it is no more proper to human than to divine justice, to remit the sentence of law when guilt is palpable and unequivocal, and evidently equal to the punishment which it has incurred. That a compassionate sympathy with the condition of the criminal, or a reluctance to inflict pain or death, should operate to his escape from punishment, would, it is obvious, be accounted a fault in the judicial administration, and be universally deprecated as tending to the subversion of society. Our religion, it is true, instructs us to suppress the spirit of retaliation toward those who have injured us; but, notwithstanding, as members of the social body, and bound, as such, to aim at the promotion of the common good, we aspire to a character of inexorableness toward the violators of right and law. We rigorously uphold, however we may deplore, the sentence which dooms the guilty to suffer or to die, and we account those to have been examples of heroic virtue, who, in this respect, have sacrificed the claims of kindred and friendship on the altar of political rectitude.

‘There appears to be no pure, intelligent principle of forgiveness in the judicial wisdom of this world. Human legislation discovers no other elements of mercy than its weaknesses and imperfections. What is called a discretionary power, and lauded as a prerogative of mercy, is simply a right of determination on grounds which the law is unable to anticipate, and consequently cannot decide upon. It is impossible, beforehand, to describe all the circumstances which may diminish the guilt of a particular offence; and hence it is expedient to leave ample scope, for the supply of deficiency, or the correction of error; or in flattering, but, as it would seem, inaccurate language, to place in the ruling power a right of dispensation, or prerogative of mercy. Moreover, as men are so liable to err in their decisions, it becomes a principle of natural equity to incline to the side of clemency and remission. Undoubtedly, however, as crimes become more clearly discriminated, the penalties annexed to them better selected or proportioned, and the rules of evidence more satisfactorily ascertained, punishment is more rarely remitted. In other words, the more comprehensive the wisdom of the legislature, the more certain is the execution of its enactments.’

—pp. 4—6.

It is obvious from this course of remark, that as imperfect knowledge, or defective wisdom pertains not to the Divine Being, the parity of reasoning in the two cases, on which so much has been founded, utterly fails. In a subsequent part of the discourse, it is shown that the law, instead of being abrogated, or rendered less imperative by the gospel, is in fact brought out in the New Testament, in its spirituality and unalterableness, with much greater clearness than in the Old—as though man had been deemed incapable of bearing a full disclosure of his condition as a revolted creature, until it came to be placed along with a perfect disclosure of the means of pardon and recovery; and it is made

fully to appear that men are exempted from the punishment of their sins, not on account of any relaxation in the law which they have violated, but in virtue of the expiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

The second sermon presents a further step in the same great argument. It is intended to show, contrary to the argument of the Unitarian, that the rite of sacrifice under the law was an ordained type of the sacrifice of Christ. In answer to the assertion that the apostles have expressed themselves as they have done on this subject, merely from a tendency to indulge in strong Hebrew forms of speech, it is maintained that no such ground can be made tenable, without imputing to the inspired writers a use of figurative language altogether foreign from its nature and purpose, and not only calculated, in an eminent degree, to mislead, but directly contrary to the clearest and most simple declarations of the Scriptures generally.

We shall not stay to consider our Author's views with regard to 'the Advocacy of Christ,' which is the subject of the third sermon, though it would no doubt gratify many of our readers to witness the keen perception and effect with which the writer seizes on the language of the Unitarians on this subject, and points out the sameness of the principles which it involves with those on which the doctrine of the Atonement rests, both in the Scriptures, and in the writings of orthodox divines. But we are tempted onward by the subject of the two following discourses—'the Hope of the First Christians.'

The object of the preacher in these sermons is to show that the first Christians exhibited an attitude of mind, or state of feeling in relation to a future existence, including an amount of earnest hope and desire, which is rarely, if ever, evinced among ourselves. We have found much to admire in these discourses, but must confess that our impression after reading them is not of that altered kind which the Author clearly means to produce. We think he has not looked with a sufficient comprehensiveness at the records of the primitive church, even as furnished by the sacred writers; and he has in consequence, as we think, overrated the piety of those times; while, from some other cause, he has underrated that of his own day. The epistles to the seven churches, and even those of Paul, if carefully examined, will be found to present no very flattering picture of the Christian profession even in those times. Where whole churches are not open to heavy censures, we commonly find that many included in them are regarded as deserving to be so visited. Our Author's views, moreover, with regard to the influence of persecution, and of the evidence of miracles, on the hope of the first Christians, though such as are commonly entertained, have long appeared to us as very doubtful. God is not dependent on persecution, any

more than upon any one means of discipline beside, for the perfecting of the saints. It is manifest, also, that the terrors of persecution in the Apostolic age, were not such as to prevent the appearance of many false professors, and the checks which did not serve to prevent a large supply of that sort, were not necessarily such as to preclude a low state of spirituality elsewhere.

With regard to the influence of miracles,—in this age of physical science, when pretensions of that nature are so readily put down, by the sifting and exposure to which they are immediately subject, it is difficult to form an adequate notion of the comparative ease with which such claims were maintained two thousand years ago. Added to which, the real miracles which had been attendant during four thousand years on the footsteps of the church, had made such interferences familiar to the faith of the wisest and the best of men, and favoured, incidentally, the pretensions of impostors. Certain it is, that at that period, not only the priests of all countries, but the philosophers scarcely less, were concerned to pass for personages capable of bending the laws of nature in no mean degree to their pleasure. The Alexandrian Platonists were almost as extravagant in their pretensions and tales on that subject as the monks of the Middle Age. The difficulty accordingly was, not to find men laying claim, and upon grounds that might then have been deemed valid, to miraculous powers, but rather to move any where abroad without meeting with such men. Hence it is remarkable, that, from the time of the Saviour's ministry, and that of Peter and John, no man considered himself bound to admit the truth of Christianity, because not prepared to disprove the miracles alleged to have been wrought in attestation of it. Porphyry followed in the train of multitudes who admitted the miracle, but who denied its connexion with the power by which it was said to have been performed.

In the remaining part of this volume we find much to admire, but some things also to which we must take decided exception. The Sermons on the Love of the World; on the Nine Lepers; on sufferings a Proof of the Divine Goodness; on Repentance in Affliction; and on the Love of our Neighbour, and of our Enemies; carry with them the impress of the mind and heart of the Author, and can hardly be read by the class of persons to whom they are addressed without benefit. But the great object of the discourses on the Renewal of the Mind in Christians, and on Faith and Justification, is to correct certain views, or modes of statement on those subjects, among Evangelical preachers, which the writer deems erroneous, or as tending to produce misconception. And it is here we are most at issue with him. Opposition to error rarely leads to a calm and clear view of truth. By the repulsion from one extreme, we are almost sure to be thrown upon the other. We do not scruple to admit that there is some

ground for the strictures of the Author on all the points which fall under his powerful censorship; but we are confident that the errors which he labours to correct do not exist either in the strength or prevalence which he apprehends, and his reasoning in relation to them will no doubt be adopted by many, who, in the place of using it, as we believe he would wish it to be used, to subserve a more enlightened and practical piety, will put it into requisition on the side of a miserable formalism. It is true, in order to do this, such persons must take the writer's argument in some of its parts only, and not as a whole. But we have seen enough of human nature to be only too well persuaded that this will be done; and little grateful as such a statement may be to an Author, we must express it as our undoubting expectation, that the good done by the particular discourses adverted to, will be greatly outweighed by the evil,—the errors which the writer is aiming to correct in one quarter, being, in effect, trivial, compared with those he will strengthen in another. It would also be easy to show, that the principles which pervade this volume, are such as pledge the preacher to a sound exposition of the oracles of God, and that he never departs from that course without involving himself in manifest inconsistency. Thus there are passages in the sermon on the Love of the World, which are sufficient in themselves to destroy the whole argument of that on the Renewal of the Mind in Christians; and there are others in the sermons on Faith and Justification, which evince so much intelligent and devout solicitude to exclude the idea of personal merit from the salvation of the sinner, as to make it not a little strange that we should meet with them in a connexion where the main argument is of so different a tendency—an argument, we will say in brief, which, as it confounds justification with sanctification, can never be made intelligible in itself, or accordant with a just and comprehensive view of the inspired writers. We will only add, that the Author of this volume is not a person who can need to be reminded, that the men who have maintained the doctrine of justification by faith in the precise form which he combats, are just those who gave existence to Protestantism, and have preserved to it nearly all the vitality which it has any where retained—that they have been in fact a people so far abounding in good works, as to have been generally censured by persons of different sentiments on this point, as being 'righteous over-much.' Exceptions may occur on either side; but, looking to the average effect of the doctrine opposed by our Author, and of that maintained by the great majority of his communion, we hesitate not a moment in forming our conclusion as to which of those views is assuredly most conducive to fervent piety and sound morals. Indeed the Author seems to labour under something so much like a misgiving of this sort himself, that we strongly suspect whether his

very cautious and modified view of the doctrine will be really much more acceptable in his own ecclesiastical circle than the broad scriptural view of it as maintained by Luther and Hooker.

But we must find space, in conclusion, on several accounts, for one more of the many passages we have marked in this volume. The following is from the sermon on the Love of the World. The preacher remarks, while enforcing the exhortations of the New Testament on this subject. '— But it may be said, 'that the descriptions given of the world in the Scriptures are 'scarcely applicable to our time, inasmuch as Christianity has 'effected an important reformation in our religious and moral 'principles.' Taking all such considerations into fair account, it is still demanded—

'But has the Gospel so prevailed amongst us? has the love of God become so ascendant a principle in our minds, as that those subjects which, in old time, enticed his creatures to disobedience, make a vain appeal to our affections? has the world lost its power to tempt—to engross, infatuate, and destroy? and has the apostate spirit, who was described as the god of it, been driven from his usurpation, and his agency destroyed in 'blinding the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them?' Is the world then a terror of other times? the bug-bear of an antiquated theology? 'the lust of the eye, the pride of life'—have they ceased from amongst us? Have we no longer to lament and deprecate the abuse of that passion which the Almighty hallowed by the institution of marriage? abuse of it which perverts the difference of sex into a source of bitterness and degradation; which renders man the worst enemy of woman, her busy tempter to evil, her remorseless conductor to infamy and desolation,—or associates them in habitual alienation from God, and rejection of his mercy? are the simple appetites of hunger and thirst no more perverted to obscure the reason, to deaden the moral feelings, and to obstruct the influence of things unseen and future? has the love of lucre ceased to impair the justice and congeal the charity of men; degrading in their esteem the claims of others, and rendering them insensible to their wants and sufferings? has the thirst of fame and distinction lost its power to stir our unsocial and malevolent feelings, and to make us creatures of envy and detraction? is power laid aside as an instrument of injustice and oppression, or never used as a weapon of revenge? are rank and wealth no longer received as reasons for contempt of inferiors and dependents? no longer the nutriment of selfish pride and heartless ostentation? truly our self-gratulation must turn, upon reflection, into deep confusion, as professors of the Gospel, and might well provoke from an enemy of our faith a pungent satire, and a bitter scorn.

p. 151.

The British Critic, classing this volume with several others under the same title, has favoured it with the 'notice' of some

three or four lines, in which the substance of the statement is, that Mr. Smith's Discourses are 'sound,' and not without occasional indications of power, but 'rather dry!' We should like to see their reverences of the British Critic, employed in naming a dozen men in their whole hierarchy qualified to produce Discourses like those, on which it has appeared good to them, to bestow this elaborate attention and eulogy. For our own part, we have wished to acquit ourselves fairly towards the Author of this volume, and we feel that we do not more than this, in strongly recommending his publication to that class of readers who are capable of appreciating works characterized by real worth, though containing much, perhaps, to which their judgment can by no means extend an entire approval.

Art. V. *Random Recollections of the Lords and Commons.*
 Second Series. By the Author of 'The Great Metropolis,' &c. &c.
 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn. 1838.

WE are not surprised to find that the first series of the 'Random Recollections' met with extraordinary success. There was much in the publication to deserve and to insure it. The novelty of the design, the strict impartiality and unvarying good humor of the sketches, the great diligence evinced in the collection of facts, and the healthful moral tone of the work, predicted the success which, we are now informed, has been realised. This is as it should be, and the author has done well, in requiting the patronage of the public, by a continuation of his work. The present series has been written in the same spirit as its predecessor, and the utmost care has been taken 'to insure the greatest possible 'accuracy.' Those who are acquainted with the Author's former productions will need no evidence of the truth of his assertion, 'that he has been most anxious to guard against anything like 'ill-natured remark, and that his earnest desire has been to write 'in the spirit of perfect impartiality.' It would be too much to say that his own political views are not evident, but it may safely be affirmed that his attachments are not so unreasonable as to blind him to the faults of his party, or to prevent his administering the reproof they deserve. The present series labours under one disadvantage, which no skill or diligence on the part of the author could remedy. His former work introduced us to the leading members of the two Houses;—the men who are most prominently before the public, and exert most influence over our national affairs. Hence the interest of the present publication is not equal to that of its predecessor, and some readers, forgetting

the obvious necessity of the case, will be in danger of charging on the Author, what belongs to his subject. The few extracts which our space permits us to make, may serve, however, to assure them that there is much amusement as well as information to be gathered from his pages.

The following extract is descriptive of a scene in which some of the distinctive features of Lord Brougham's character and oratory were strongly marked.

'No one, I am sure, who had the good fortune to hear his first speech on the Canadian question, will ever forget it. It occupied three hours in the delivery, and was perhaps one of the most masterly and brilliant efforts ever made within the walls of either House of Parliament. The ridicule he heaped on the devoted heads of ministers, was, in a moral sense, absolutely annihilating. The sarcasms he levelled at Lord Glenelg, when criticising the noble Lord's despatches to the Governor of Canada, were literally withering. I use no exaggeration when I say, that the friends of ministers, and especially of Lord Glenelg, must have commiserated them from the bottom of their hearts—must have felt for them precisely in the same way as if the punishment which Lord Brougham was inflicting on them had been of a bodily or physical nature. The affair altogether strongly reminded me of a cross-tempered remorseless pedagogue, unsparingly applying the birch—regardless alike of their piteous looks and whining cries—to the persons of some half-dozen of his urchins, who had had the misfortune either to merit punishment, or to incur his displeasure when in one of his more savage moods. What added to the effect of Lord Brougham's castigation of ministers in this case was, that every one present saw clearly that ministers themselves felt it in all its rigorous severity. If anything could have given additional effect to the heaviness of every successive blow, it would have been the appearance and manner of his lordship. It did not seem to require an effort. His heart was evidently in the work: there were no indications of a reluctant application of the rod; as in the case of a father who does violence to his parental feelings when he chastises his child, and is only induced to do so from a conviction of its necessity, with a view to the correction of errors. With Lord Brougham the thing was manifestly a labour of love. You saw in the leer of his eye, in the general expression of his features, in the exulting tones of his voice, that to behold ministers writhing around him, was to him a positive luxury, and one of the highest order. The friends of ministers, as before observed, must have felt for them the more deeply, because every one knew that they could not retaliate on their noble tormentor. The effects of his ponderous blows were clearly of too stunning a nature to admit of any hope of that. And the event proved that such was the right view of the case.

'Lord Melbourne rose to reply when Lord Brougham sat down; but signal was the failure of the noble Premier's attempt. I have often seen him in the course of his speech, when a little excited by what had fallen from some opponent, hesitate and stammer and become confused;

but in this case he had great difficulty in making a beginning at all. He seemed, for some time after he rose, as if he had been suffering under a degree of excitement which painfully and to a serious extent affected his organs of respiration. He breathed so rapidly, and laboured under so heavy a load of temporary excitement, that a full quarter of a minute elapsed before he could utter a distinct sentence. Nearly that time elapsed, indeed, before he could deliver himself of two connected words. And even when, as he proceeded, he recovered in some degree his self-possession or usual calmness, he did not make an effort to reply formally to Lord Brougham's tremendous attack, but contented himself with a short speech of the most general kind. The Marquis of Lansdowne was also fain to deal exclusively in generalities. Last of all came Lord Glenelg. Not less was his prudence than that of his two noble colleagues, as regarded a direct effort at reply to his merciless assailant; but it must be confessed that he was more happy than either of them, inasmuch as he met the ridicule of Lord Brougham with the same weapon, and with some success. It is right, however, to mention that Lord Brougham had by this time quitted the house. How keenly Lord Glenelg smarted under the scorpion tongue of Lord Brougham, may be inferred from the circumstance of his having used an expression, which I believe he was never known to use before in either House of Parliament, and which, being a religious man, he would not, I am sure, use at any time or in any place, except when under the influence of strongly excited feelings. The expression to which I refer was - '*For God's sake* let the noble and learned Lord spare us his pain and his pity.*' Lord Glenelg must be aware that this expression approaches, if indeed it do not constitute, a transgression of the commandment which forbids the taking the name of the Deity in vain; and I am sure, he must afterwards have regretted that he made use of it.—Vol. I., pp. 29—34.

Lord Brougham, as every one knows, is the most regular attendant in the Upper House. Our author represents the Duke of Wellington as claiming the second place of honor, and furnishes the following sketch of the hero of a thousand fields.

'In my first series of '*Random Recollections of the House of Lords*,' I stated that the Duke of Cumberland, now the King of Hanover, was the most regular in his attendance in the house of any noble lord; and had he been still in this country, in the capacity simply of a Peer of the realm, I have no doubt that he would have continued to retain the distinction. His mantle has fallen, as regards regularity of attendance, on the Duke of Wellington. He is almost invariably to be seen among the first who make their appearance on the opening of the doors, and he is usually among the last to quit the

* 'This referred to the circumstance of Lord Brougham's having in the course of his speech said that he felt pain and pity at the situation of ministers, in relation to their conduct on the Canada question.'

house. He is usually wrapped up, close to the mouth, in a narrow brown cloak which does not reach the length of his knees. He is a man of whom the Tory party may well be proud. He is in every respect a credit to that party. Most assiduously and heartily does he labour in their service: not, indeed, with the view of promoting party purposes; but because he deems Toryism to be heaven-born, and consequently most conducive to the interests of the empire. I have no idea that any other consideration than that of a persuasion that he is acting for the welfare of the country would ever operate on his mind. Mistaken as I regard him to be in many points of essential importance, I cannot resist the conviction that he is actuated by the purest motives. I cannot conceive that anything but genuine, even if misguided patriotism, could induce such active exertions in a man who has attained the advanced age of seventy; who has so distinguished a reputation; and who is, moreover, so advantageously circumstanced in reference to pecuniary matters, as the Duke. It is no less gratifying than surprising to see a man who has reached such an age, and undergone so much anxiety of mind, and great physical fatigue, looking so well and in such excellent spirits. Nothing but an extraordinary energy of mind, and a constitution of the most robust kind, could have enabled the Duke to survive the circumstances in which he has been placed, and the hardships he has undergone. There he sits, night after night, with his arms usually folded on his breast, and his right leg thrown over the left, listening most attentively to everything which is passing in the house, and looking as fresh and vigorous as if he were still in the prime of life. His grey hair, approaching to whiteness, is the principal if not the only index to the accumulation of years which has gathered on his head, which his personal aspect affords. If one might judge from present appearances—though in such matters we all know how deceptive appearances often are—the conclusion would be, that the Duke is destined to live for many years to come.'

—ib., pp. 41—43.

Much has been said on the inattention paid to their parliamentary duties by honorable members. Few, however, who are not in the habit of attending the House, have any conception of the scene sometimes witnessed. Nor can we hope for much improvement, till a thorough revolution is effected in the hours of attendance, and the mode of conducting public business. It is too much to expect that dulness should be listened to with interest, or that men, even of robust constitutions, should be able to labor throughout the night. The following extract is literally true:

'There are others, again, who were all promise and protestation in their canvass and on the hustings, who are tolerably regular in their attendance in the house, in so far as concerns their personal presence, but who, for all practical purposes, might just as well be anywhere else. They not only never open their mouths to suggest anything in the shape of an improvement of any measure which is under consideration, but they are as listless and inattentive to everything that is going

forward, as if they were so many statues. Persons of this class are sometimes to be seen as fast asleep in their seats, as if they had not been in bed for the previous half-dozen nights. Others are as busy talking to their next neighbours, as if the great duty of the members were to assemble in the House of Commons for the purpose of spending a few hours in the veriest and most puerile gossip. A goodly number of the same class spend a very considerable portion of their legislative existence in the side galleries of the house, stretched out on the seats at full length, and enjoying their slumbers as soundly as if they were reposing on a bed of down. I have sometimes felt uneasy lest some of the more bustling members should, in their transit from one part of the gallery to the other, be so inconsiderate or so unpolite, as unnecessarily to disturb their lethargic fellow-legislators. You would positively fancy that some of these sleepy M.P.'s never enjoy the luxury of a bed at home. Last session, there was an Irish member who was seen, night after night, to take his nap in the gallery, as regularly and seemingly with as much comfort to himself, as if he had been reposing on his bed.

*

*

*

*

‘Cobbett, who never lost an opportunity of saying something at the expense of those clergymen who make a profession of religion only for the purpose of promoting their secular views, used to say, that he wondered how two such clergymen could pass each other in the street without laughing. Cobbett meant that it must have been difficult to pass each other without laughing at the credulity of the people in being deceived by them. I have often wondered, when I have seen two honourable members who had been sleeping close to each other, awake from their slumbers about the same time,—how they could look one another in the face without a hearty laugh at the delusion under which their constituents laboured, when they returned them under the conviction that they were to be most indefatigable and exemplary in the discharge of their parliamentary duties.’—*ib.*, pp. 202—205.

Among the various farces which are acted at the present day, none are more ridiculous, than the personal squabbles which occasionally occur in the House. The show of courage is utterly disproportioned to the amount of danger incurred. Great swelling words of vanity are uttered, while the actors and spectators are perfectly aware, that at the proper moment, and in the due form of parliamentary etiquette, explanations and concessions will be mutually made. The greatest enemy of the legislature could not wish it worse than that these scenes should be multiplied. They lower the character of parliament, and thus destroy the confidence and respect of the people for their representatives. Scenes more disgraceful could scarcely happen in the lowest places of public resort. But our author shall describe what he has so frequently witnessed :

‘Many are the kinds of farce which are performed every session, in the Commons’ House of Parliament ; but I know of no such exhibi-

tion more calculated to excite a feeling of disrespect—not to use a stronger term—for the representative body, than the personal squabbles of a hostile character which so repeatedly occur between two members. One makes a severe remark on some political opponent; the latter repels the insinuation, or resents the alleged affront, by some still stronger and more pointed personal observation. Cries of ‘Order, order!’ ‘Chair, chair!’ follow from all parts of the side of the house opposite to that whence the strong language proceeded. The party at whom it was levelled starts up with great warmth, and applies to his antagonist in the quarrel, one or more epithets of so very offensive a nature, that the other must either take notice of the circumstance by a hint that a hostile message will be sent to the party making use of the epithets, or submit to the imputation of being regarded as a coward by the M.P.’s of both sides of the house. The former course, that namely, of assuming a hostile aspect, is invariably resorted to, except in the very few cases in which honourable members have publicly declared that in no circumstances will they fight a duel. It is resorted to the more readily, inasmuch as both parties are perfectly sure that no powder-and-shot affair will take place,—the Speaker in such cases uniformly interposing the shield of his official power to prevent any catastrophe. The hostile defiance, or the hostile threat, is however received with deafening appeals to the ‘Chair,’ and cries of ‘Order, order!’ which are enough to frighten persons, unaccustomed to such scenes, out of their wits. Other honourable members get up, sometimes in half-dozens at once, and address poor Mr. Speaker, with great vehemence of manner, insisting that not only have the parties made use of improper language to each other, but that they have conducted themselves in a most unparliamentary manner, and with great disrespect to the House.

‘These appeals to the Speaker usually terminate with the expression of a hope that the parties will individually withdraw their offensive language. Mr. Speaker, like a man of sense, and knowing with an absolute certainty that the whole affair will end in smoke—though not in the smoke of a pistol—takes it all quite coolly. He does not suffer his equanimity to be disturbed, either by the hostile words or the threatening manner of the parties.

‘In the mean time, some other member—or it may be three or four at a time—gets up and insists that one of the parties was the aggressor, and that consequently he ought to be made to retract the improper terms first. Before the honourable gentleman who makes this observation has completed the sentence, another leaps to his feet, and vociferates an entirely different view of the matter. It was the other party who was the aggressor, and therefore he ought to retract and apologise to the House first.

‘While all this is going on, some five or six of the honourable gentlemen nearest to each of the belligerents are beseeching them, by every possible consideration, to rise and assure the Speaker and the House that no more notice will be taken of the matter. The parties refuse, with a dogged obstinacy, to do anything of the kind. They look very consequential, or mighty big, as Mr. O’Connell would say;

they feel they are the observed of all observers, and that even the great business of the nation has for a time given way to the interest which is taken in their personal squabbles. They consequently look on the matter as an era in their history: they think of the space which they will next day fill in the public eye, as they do at that time in the eye of the House; and therefore very naturally endeavour to keep up the scene as long as they can. They not only pertinaciously refuse to listen to the solicitations of those around them to let the matter drop, but you would fancy, from the cavalier manner they have assumed, that nothing on earth will satisfy them, but either sending a bullet through their adversary, or receiving that particular favour at his hands.

‘The uproar and confusion continue all this while to increase in the house. Members rise in dozens, and each takes his own view of the matter. Anything more discordant than the sounds which now assail one’s ears, it were impossible to imagine. The confusion of tongues which prevailed at Babel, could have been nothing to the confusion, which in such cases obtains in the House of Commons—a place which is supposed to be pre-eminently remarkable for the deliberate and orderly character of its proceedings.

‘Eventually the noise partially dies away. Fewer members speak at once; and the cries of ‘Chair, chair!’ ‘Order, order!’ are neither so numerous nor of so stentorian a character. Then something is heard to drop from honourable gentlemen, about the disrespect offered to the House by the militant parties. One of them starts up that moment to his feet to disclaim all intention of having, either by what he has said or done, meant the slightest disrespect to the House, and to assure the Speaker that he is most willing to bow with submission to whatever view he takes of the matter. The other follows the example, and also throws himself unreservedly into the hands of the Speaker, who desires both to withdraw the offensive expressions. Both make a further show of valour, by again disclaiming any disrespect to the House, and apologising for having said or done anything which could have been so construed. They have scarcely uttered the words, when up leaps some honourable member to his feet, and protests against the House receiving the disclaimer, on the ground of its not containing a pledge that no further steps will be taken in reference to the personal part of the matter. Both parties are again requested to give that pledge, but they are deaf to all entreaties. They are much too valorous for that. At length the Speaker interposes. He talks about having to perform a painful duty, and gives certain pretty broad hints about a personage known by the name of the Serjeant-at-Arms, whose services will become necessary, should the militants not at once cease hostilities, and promise that nothing further will be done in the business. They both, with much seeming reluctance; give the required promise; their anxiety to keep up their assumed valour to the last requiring that the pledge should not be voluntarily given. The matter thus ends, after very possibly, having occupied the attention of the House, to the interruption of most important business, for an hour or an hour and a half.’—*ib.*, 205—211.

Our author has furnished his readers with several personal sketches, from two or three of which we must indulge ourselves with extracts. Mr. Charles Villiers, the Member for Wolverhampton, is one of the rising men of the House. His recent speech on the Apprenticeship question, only confirmed the favorable impression he had previously made. His favorite theme is the Corn Laws, of which he is the able and steady opponent. Our Author describes him in the following passage :

‘Mr. C. Villiers is steadily rising in parliamentary reputation. His information is varied and accurate, and he turns it, in most cases, to good account. In the course of the present session, he made a very able and argumentative speech, in opposition to the Corn Laws, which occupied two hours in the delivery, and which was of itself sufficient to have given him some reputation in the house. What struck me particularly in his speech, was the clearness with which he treated an intricate subject, and the interest he contrived to impart to topics which are generally considered of a dry and unattractive nature. I have not often heard a speech in which there was a greater body of figures and facts blended with strong arguments. He was listened to with a degree of attention by the House, which is seldom accorded to honourable members when they speak for so long a space of time on such topics. And so engrossed was the honourable gentleman himself with his subject, that it was with difficulty he could be persuaded, after he had resumed his seat, that he had been on his legs above half the time. A gentleman who saw him a few minutes after he had concluded his address, lately mentioned to me, that on his observing to him that he had made a two hours’ speech, he looked, in the first instance, as if he had supposed the observation was meant ironically, and that the party intended to convey the idea, that either his matter or his manner, or both, had been so dull, that those who heard him had really thought he had been thrice the length of time on his legs which he actually was. ‘You began at six,’ said the gentleman. ‘I did,’ was the answer of Mr. Villiers. ‘And it is only a few minutes since you concluded?’ There was no denying it, and Mr. Villiers accordingly assented. ‘Well, and it is fifteen minutes past eight now,’ continued the other, drawing out his watch. The fact stared Mr. Villiers in the face, and he was surprised that he should have thought the time so short.

‘Mr. Villiers possesses considerable readiness as a public speaker. He does not write his speeches, except in peculiar circumstances. It consists with my own knowledge that he did not write the speech to which I have referred, though extending to so great a length, and though so largely interspersed with figures and facts. From this circumstance I infer that he must at once have an excellent memory, and superior talents for promptly marshalling his facts, arranging his figures, and putting his arguments and ideas into proper order. His style is perspicuous and expressive. There is no appearance of effort about it. He dislikes a fustian and tinsel diction, and would not on any consideration sport a far-fetched, sickly sentimentality. He speaks with much

ease: addressing the House does not seem to be a task to him. His utterance is rapid, but not so much so as to affect the distinctness of his articulation. His voice is clear and pleasant. I am convinced he has never done it justice in the house. He is always audible, but there is a want of variety and volume in the tones of his voice, simply because he does not take the trouble to turn its capabilities to proper account. His action is moderate: he slightly moves his head and body backwards and forwards, and when he comes to what he conceives a good point in his speech, applies his right hand with considerable force to the back of the seat before him. His manners and appearance altogether are unassuming. He has an open, cheerful expression of countenance. His eyes are clear and intelligent. His features are small and regular, and his complexion is rather darkish, but indicative of good health. His hair is of a light-brown hue. In person he is about the general height, and well formed. He is a young man, being only about his fortieth year.'—Vol. II., pp. 191—194.

Mr. Hindley, the member for Ashton-under-Lyne, is one of the most estimable men in the British Parliament, being equally distinguished for private worth, and for a conscientious attention to his public duties. The return of such a man reflects high honor on Ashton, and we should be glad to see the example generally followed. Instead of neglecting their political duties, on the plea of conscience, it would better become the religious members of the community, to increase the number of such representatives. Our author does Mr. Hindley no more than justice in the following passage.

'Mr. C. Hindley, member for Ashton-under-Lyne, does not take a prominent part in the discussions of the House; a circumstance at which I am much surprised; for he is not only a man of varied and accurate information on most of the questions which come under the consideration of parliament, but he is a highly respectable speaker. Let me not be understood as here wishing to convey the idea, that the honourable gentleman has any pretensions to the name of an orator. When I characterize him as a speaker, I mean that he speaks with much ease, and in such a way as, in most cases, to insure the attention of the most intelligent members of the house. He always evinces a thorough acquaintance with his subject, and often speaks with very great effect. I have known him on several occasions make a deep impression on the House. He is one of those who warms and becomes more animated with his theme. His happiest efforts have always been those in which the question at issue involved to a great extent the principles of justice and humanity. He is one of the most humane men in the house. And be it said to his everlasting honour, that when his own private interests come in collision with the claims of humanity, he never hesitates a moment in sacrificing the former to the latter. A memorable instance of this was furnished by the honourable gentleman when the subject of the factory children's hours of labour was before the House. Though himself an extensive cotton manufacturer in Lancashire, and though one of those who have benefited to a very large

amount annually by the protracted hours of labour in the factories, he was one of the most zealous advocates for short hours, from considerations of pure humanity to the youthful unfortunates themselves. It was a positive luxury to hear Mr. Hindley, Mr. Brotherton, and various other honourable gentlemen, addressing the House, when the Factory Bill was under consideration. How striking the contrast between the spirit which their speeches breathed, and that which pervaded the heartless harangues of Whig political economists!

‘Mr. Hindley is a most benevolent as well as humane man, and his benevolence, like his humanity, is not confined, as that of too many is, to mere speculation. It is embodied in acts. I learn from private sources of information, and have great pleasure in recording the fact, that he yearly expends a very large portion of his wealth in the promotion of benevolent objects. His benevolence—and that, after all, will be found the only genuine benevolence—is based on the doctrines of evangelical religion. Mr. Hindley is, I believe, a congregational dissenter.

‘Though not, as before stated, in the habit of taking an active part in the debates in the house, the honourable gentleman is regular in his attendance on his legislative duties, and is in every respect a member of great practical utility. He is a good man of business, and is one of the most efficient members on committees.

‘Usually, when he commences his speeches, he speaks in so low and subdued a tone as to be scarcely audible in the more distant parts of the house; but when, as already observed, he proceeds a little further, especially if the question involve any great principle of humanity, he becomes warmer and more energetic, and then he not only speaks in sufficiently loud tones, but his voice is pleasant, and is sometimes modulated with considerable effect. His utterance is, if anything, rather hurried. He speaks with considerable fluency; rarely hesitating for a suitable expression, or having to recal a wrong word in order that a right one may be substituted. His action is variable. Sometimes he has scarcely any; at other times he liberally moves his arms, especially his right arm, backwards and forwards, and looks from one part of the opposite side of the house to the other. In most cases, however, he chiefly addresses himself to the Speaker. There is always great earnestness in his manner: there is no resisting the conclusion that he speaks from conviction, and only from conviction.

‘As a speaker his personal appearance is not in his favour. He is of less than the average height, of a pale complexion, rather thin face, and has a thoughtful expression of countenance. His features are strongly marked: his eyes are deeply set, and he has a protruding forehead. His hair is of a darkish hue, and usually hangs carelessly about his brow. If his appearance may be depended on, his age is about forty-five.’—*ib.*, pp. 197—201.

The following notice of Mr. Charles Lushington must close our extracts:

‘Mr. Lushington is a man of superior intelligence. He possesses a sound judgment, as well as extensive information. He is cool and

calculating in all he says and does. Reason, and not the passions, is the guide of his conduct. In politics he is liberal, but cannot with propriety be classed among the Radical party. He is one of the most consistent of our public men: and his strict integrity as a politician, any more than his excellence as a private man, has never, so far as I am aware, been questioned. I believe there are few men who act more thoroughly and uniformly from conscientious motives. As a speaker he cannot be ranked high: his voice has something hard about it, and is not sufficiently powerful for effective public speaking. He appears to much greater advantage at a public meeting than in the House of Commons. His utterance is timed with judgment to the ear: it avoids the extremes of slowness and rapidity; but it wants variety as well as a pleasant tone. He occasionally hesitates, especially when speaking extemporaneously. His speeches usually indicate the possession of more than a respectable measure of intellect on the part of the speaker. He is a good reasoner: indeed, were there sometimes less argument, and more declamation in his speeches, they would tell with much greater effect on a popular assembly like the House of Commons. His statements are always clear; and the drift of his argument can never be mistaken. His style is chaste, without any indications of its being laboriously polished. He deals not in the flowers of rhetoric; nor has he, either in matter or manner, any of the clap-traps so generally observable in the speeches of our modern orators. His gesture is moderate and rational. He seldom speaks long at a time; but his speeches usually contain much valuable matter. If they never display originality, or any particular vigour of mind, there is never anything feeble or silly in them.

* * * *

‘Mr. Lushington does not speak with frequency; but he is much respected by men of all shades of political opinion, and always commands attention when he rises. He invariably employs the most unexceptionable language in speaking of an opponent. He never mixes himself up with any of the squabbles which take place in the house: even when attacked in acrimonious terms by others, he maintains his temper. He repels the attack with much firmness, but in the most temperate language. I recollect seeing the honourable gentleman, two or three years ago, give a striking proof of his command of temper, at a meeting of the supporters to the Mendicity Society. Some nobleman, whose name has escaped my recollection, made some ill-natured observations in consequence of some unpalatable opinions—unpalatable, I mean, to the party—which Mr. Lushington had previously expressed. The tone and temper in which Mr. Lushington replied to the noble lord’s attack must have administered to his assailant a severe rebuke, apart from the words, if the mind of the latter had an ordinary share of susceptibility.’—*ib.*, pp. 217—220.

A few minor inaccuracies have occurred to us in perusing these volumes. Mr. Brotherton is not, we believe, either a congregationalist or baptist, and Mr. Hindley, if we have not been misinformed, is a moravian. Some few opinions are expressed

from which we are compelled to dissent, as an instance of which we may refer to the sweeping condemnation passed on the New Poor Law Bill,—a measure which, considered as a whole, is one of the most enlightened and beneficial acts of modern legislation. These, however, are but trifles, and make no sensible deduction from the interest and value of the work. Of the general character of its materials, the extracts we have furnished will enable our readers to judge, and we shall be glad to find that the same patronage which attended on the former series has been afforded to this. We thank our Author for the information he has afforded us, and wish him good speed in his future labours.

Art. VI. *Union ; or, The Divided Church made One.* By the Rev. JOHN HARRIS, author of 'Mammon.' London: Thomas Ward & Co. 1838.

IT was mentioned to us by a friend, the other day, that Doctor Hales, the well-known and learned author of the *Analysis of Ancient Chronology*, had consented, on a certain occasion, to an interview with our informant, who had the honour of being his godson, and was about to be confirmed by the bishop. The doctor, somewhat stiff and stern, as well as formal in his habits, though full of real benevolence, requested him to repeat the decalogue; which was done, of course, with the greatest accuracy: but, at the close of it, nothing more astonished him, than a direction from his worthy sponsor, that he should recite the *eleventh* commandment! He hesitated, as many other youths of his peculiar communion would have done,—stopt,—and stared. 'Ah, my dear lad,' said the chronologist, 'never forget, while you live, 'the *eleventh* commandment;—*a new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as Christ has loved you, that ye also love one another.*' John xiii. 34. The impression made was not less electric than it has proved lasting. The youth became a man: and having subsequently taken orders in the establishment, he has lived to surmount many of its prejudices; and is at the present moment, if we mistake not, filling an office connected with missionary labours on a very large scale, with his heart consecrated to God, and expanded by the spirit of his Master.

We have recorded the anecdote, as coming from unexceptionable authority, and being too good to be lost. Perhaps our readers will also see at once that it bears upon the subject before us. Mr. Harris, in favouring us with his '*Union*,' has conferred upon the church another service, at least parallel with that which he rendered, when he published his '*Mammon*.' The title is more attractive than that of his other treatise; and although mere

style is of small importance, when the matter is of such transcendent consideration, we may just say here, lest no better opportunity should offer, that practice has much improved him in this respect; and that whilst his eloquence has increased, as we think, in its real intensity, his manner has become vastly purer, less ambitious, and more elegant. The book altogether may be described as 'apples of gold set in pictures of silver.' We hail it with delight, and trust it may circulate by thousands through the land. A brief account shall now be given of its contents, with a few observations upon them.

His first chapter exhibits the doctrine of scripture as to the unity of the church; that assembly of faithful persons, of which Christ is the solar and central glory; for whose sake he assumed an identity of nature; sealed the new covenant with his blood; sent down his Holy Spirit; and gave his inspired word, as a pillar of cloud and fire, to guide its march through the wilderness of this world to a celestial Canaan. Our author, with sound judgment, has run over the apostolic and apocalyptic epistles, that he might collect into one focus their scattered rays upon the point so near his heart: and the result of his rapid survey is no other than a clear manifestation, 'that unity is a sign of the true church; and that so complete is this unity, that the atom does not more certainly form an integral portion of the material universe, than the meanest and obscurest believer has his appointed place and portion in the one great family which is gathering together in Christ: so that unscripturally to expel a single Christian, or to disturb the harmony of a single church, is to break the peace of the universe.'

His second chapter goes into the question of Christian unity, or wherein the oneness of the church consists. He glances at some of the ideas which have more or less obtained currency; and at the attempts which at different times have been made in the church to realize this union. He shows more particularly, that it is by no means dependent upon an identity of opinion as to all details of doctrine and discipline, or faith and practice. On the contrary, a diversity on many points, not fundamental, seems to spring necessarily from differences of mental constitution, as well as various other causes; being thus in strict harmony with the visible works of Him, who combines variety of accident and form with unity of principle and design. He lays the foundation of scriptural union among Christians in the belief of those truths, which are essential to our union with Christ; such as justification by faith alone in the propitiatory sacrifice of the Redeemer. He observes that this parent doctrine involves an acknowledgment of the divinity of Jesus; the necessity for renewal and sanctification by the Holy Spirit; and whatever else is commonly called evangelical: beautifully adding, that 'it sprinkles the path of duty with atoning

‘ blood, and is the seminal element of universal holiness.’ He demonstrates that faith cannot exist alone ; but that it must work by love : that by allying us to the Saviour, it detaches us from the world ; introducing us into the society of those who have experienced a similar transition—in each of whom we must recognise a brother. He describes the cross as the single yet sufficient hope of all converts ; as the magnet of contrite sinners. He portrays the Divine Paraclete as the soul of the church ;—faith and love as being the twofold bond of its coherence : remarking, that whilst the former includes sanctification, the latter implies visibility. ‘ Hereby shall all men know that ye are my ‘ disciples,’ said Christ, ‘ if ye have love one to another.’ From faith and love combined, this holy and visible union will be universal : and just as a departure from faith is heresy, so a violation of love to the brethren, or in other words, the breach of Christian union, constitutes what is called schism.

This brings our author to his third chapter, in which his concern is, by fresh appeals to the law and the testimony, to ascertain the mind of God as to the real nature of that sin which amounts to schism ; and his conclusion is as follows, viz. : *that an exclusive, factious, and uncharitable state of mind, wherever found, is essentially a breach of the union of the church, and is therefore schism.* From this general proposition he infers that the schismatic element may exist in single individuals, although more commonly found to distinguish factions :—that a church may be professedly and externally united, and yet be filled with the evil element just adverted to :—that a church may be not only externally one, but really *one* in doctrine and discipline, and yet be schismatical :—that schism may exist in the same church, or among the same Christians, in different degrees :—that in the event of a separation, the question as to whether the guilt of schism attaches to the party leaving, or the party left, is of course to be decided by the spirit and conduct of the respective parties. It will follow, therefore, that where persons have been separated from a church, the charge of schism may lie not against the excommunicated body, but against themselves : or, on the other hand, it may lie not against those who secede, but against the communion they have quitted. This is well stated, according to our judgment, in the following passage :—

‘ Obedience to the will of Christ may render separation from a church an imperative obligation. For instance, when the church of Pergamos had received the apocalyptic warning to repent on peril of the Divine displeasure, had fifty of its members trembled and determined, in the strength of God, to obey,—and had they respectively applied to the great body of that church, representing their strong desire to remain in communion with it, and their consequent anxiety to see it cleansed from ‘ the doctrine of Balaam,’ and from ‘ the doctrine of the Nico-

laitanes,' in order that they might be able conscientiously to continue in its bosom ;—and had the great majority of that church, not only refused to listen both to the voice of the Divine warning and of the Christian remonstrance and entreaty, but had it even proceeded to draw up a creed or prescript, in which the very doctrines objected to (those of Balaam or the Nicolaitanes) were embodied, stamped with assumed infallibility, and made necessary articles of faith :—and had the fifty then mournfully and peaceably withdrawn from a church which had first misled, and afterwards oppressed them ;—which of the two parties would have been chargeable with the guilt of schism ? To wait for a reply is unnecessary.' pp. 95—96.

These views are supported by apt quotations from Hales, Barrow, Bishop Taylor, and Chillingworth ; especially from the last, who has so well shown that Protestants, with regard to the Romanists, were not *fugitivi*, but *fugati*,—‘ constrained to separate,’—unable to communicate with them any longer, not so much because they maintained errors and corruptions, as because they *imposed* them : and in this way the reader, meditating no doubt on a parallel case between certain Protestants, is conducted forward to the actual causes of schism.

These occupy the fourth chapter, in which, after employing a few pages to controvert Gibbon's insinuation, as to the tolerant nature of paganism, our author enumerates and illustrates the three sources of disunion in churches ; namely, a spirit of self-importance among their members,—a spirit of imposition on the part of their officers,—and their departure from scripture purity, or primitive simplicity. He characterises the once-boasted unity of papal christendom as the ‘ union of the contents of a boiling ‘ cauldron, kept together by iron force, but restless, heaving, and ‘ frequently fermenting over into a fire, which instantly consumed ‘ them.’ Ecclesiastical usurpations and corruptions began, indeed, at a sufficiently early period ; nor can we withhold the striking portrait of them exhibited in a subsequent passage :—

‘ The head of the mighty serpent was seen projecting from its den as early as the second century, when Victor, bishop of Rome, arrogated the power of commanding the East ; and again in the third, when Stephen excommunicated the churches of Asia and Africa for daring to differ from him on the subject of baptism ; but the fangs and the poison were then wanting. As ages elapsed, the huge reptile uncoiled its voluminous folds, emerged farther and farther from its fearful recess, and moved on from object to object, coiling around and drawing all things to itself, till nearly the whole of Europe was either lying complacently in its folds, or imprisoned and crushed in its deadly convolutions, as in the links of fate. But the history of its progress to this fearful result, is the history of the vilest passions, and the most fatal schisms ; schisms, in which the great sees of Alexandria, Con-

stantinople, Antioch, and especially Rome, stand forth in the attitude of fixed and sworn hostility to each other, and to every rival power.' p. 124.

Let every denomination lay to heart what ensues:—

'Among the many important reflections suggested by this chapter, the following seem almost forced on our attention:—1. That the additions, which man has made, from time to time, to the ordinances of God, have been the most fruitful sources of agitation and quarrel. 2. That even these have not led to actual separation, until they have been authoritatively enforced, and made indispensable. 3. That neither the one, nor the other, could have taken place, if the authority of the Bible had been regarded and revered as paramount. 4. That the supreme authority of the Bible waned in the church just in proportion as unsanctified wealth, and rank, and influence, were allowed to gain the ascendant; till the church had become a worldly corporation, and the Bible was silenced and virtually expelled. 5. That the admission of irreligious men to place or power in a Christian church, is the admission of so many agents of schism; and hence it is, partly, that in the consummation of that kingdom, which is never to be rent or removed, all such are excluded. 6. And that the Christian love, which the gospel breathes and enjoins, and which is to be found in the faithful alone, is the only balm to heal the wounds with which the church is bleeding at the hands of schism.' pp. 128—9.

The primary or auxiliary means by which the divisions of the church have been perpetrated since the Reformation, take up the fifth chapter. Mr. Harris considers them to have been the predominance of secular influence over spiritual affairs; unscriptural tests and terms of communion, such as the famous, or rather infamous Act of Uniformity in 1662; an exaggerated detestation of some heresy or corruption already acknowledged; an obstinate attachment to things as they are; the prevalence of ecclesiastical assumption; the prejudices of illiberal education; reproachful names and epithets; the exceptionable mode of conducting controversies; and the conduct of the religious public in confining their reading and intercourse almost exclusively to their own party. We were rather surprised to find our author a little disposed to underrate the gigantic evils of religious establishments. He allows that 'the exaltation of one part of the Christian community to the depression of others, has inflamed, whether justifiably or not, we stop not here to inquire, the jealousies and animosities of all:' yet, further on, he concludes, that both episcopalians and dissenters might enjoy the '*substantial*' fruits of Christian union, even during the existence of that exaltation. We feel satisfied that this can never be the result, if by the term used is meant anything beyond occasional exceptions to a general rule. We are further persuaded that opinions, analogous to our own,

are every day gaining ground amongst the more enlightened laymembers of even the Establishment itself. Here and there a clergyman, like Thomas Scott, or Legh Richmond, has associated with such nonconformists as Harmer, Adam Clarke, Ryland, or Robert Hall: just as may now and then be exhibited, upon London Bridge, a cat and mice in the same cage! The circumstances, in either case, are so curious, as to excite admiration upon reasonable grounds: but there is no actual approximation between the several species; except when a truce of God, as they called it in the middle ages, is proclaimed during the month of May, upon the platforms of the metropolis; after which, our episcopal and dissenting pastors go down into the provinces to divorce one another, *a mensâ et ex animo*, for the remaining eleven-twelfths of the year. The basis of any *substantial* union between churches must be nothing more, and nothing less, than the most perfect equality: or, otherwise, it will always terminate in going to hunt with the lion, who will appropriate to himself at least three-quarters of the spoil, together with the whole fat and marrow; graciously, however, vouchsafing a permission or toleration to his attendants to regale themselves, in the best manner they can, upon the skeleton and remnants of the carcase.

The sixth chapter of 'Union' is beyond all praise; as describing the tests of a schismatical spirit in individuals and churches. Instead of playing with the sword of the Spirit, Mr. Harris plunges it to the hilt in his own heart, and then presents it to his readers to do the same. He justly remarks, that, were Christians in general to become adequately affected with the enormity of the evils of schism, they would not merely suffer but invite the word of exhortation, and lay themselves open to its searching influence. He hypothetically delineates the Great Shepherd about to make, on his throne of judgment, an investigation into the spiritual state of the various communions of christendom:—

'Then as each church in succession came up for inspection; as its history was slowly, patiently, and impartially brought to light; as its state, at present, passed under the eye of flaming fire; and as the heart of each of its members was laid open and bare,—what strange and unexpected disclosures would take place! How many of our present subjects of congratulation and joy would prove to be reasons for humiliation and grief! how many, who have hitherto enjoyed the title of champions of the truth, would depart, branded as agents of strife, and ringleaders of faction! In many instances, the accuser would be seen taking the place of the accused; and the supposed and compassionated victim of schism be denounced as its author. Terms of communion not prescribed by the word of God,—tests of discipleship devised by man,—symbols of party, and badges of distinction,—many of those things which the churches generally make their boast and their glory,—would be denounced as the creatures of faction, and the causes

of strife, where otherwise charity would have reigned in peace.' pp. 156, 7.

We cannot think of abridging this section, or laying any analysis of its contents before our readers; rather recommending it in all its entirety to their careful and prayerful meditation. If we mistake not, it will send many a nonconformist and many an episcopalian to his knees, in lowly prostration before God. Happy, thrice happy will be the lot of those, who are ready to judge themselves rather than others; who feel disposed, far less to behold the mote that is in the eye of a brother, than to consider with contrition, and cast out with repentance, the beam that may exist in their own.

With regard to the guilt and evils of schism, the subjects of the seventh chapter, our essayist surveys the account given of them in the New Testament, together with the fearful effects which disunion produces, at the present time, upon individuals and churches, as well as upon the world at large. He begins by taking a rapid glance at the closing scenes of the Jewish economy, when the zealous spirit of party turned neighbouring temples into rival fortresses; so that Mounts Moriah and Gerizim stood perpetually frowning at each other. He notices, moreover, the remarkable fact, that in six of the epistles it is affirmed, that 'love is the fulfilling of the law;' so that a spirit of contention is in effect that evil principle which does its utmost to nullify, or at least neutralize the gospel. He further observes, that it displaces the great central doctrine of justification through faith alone, by fixing attention on points of mere ceremonial observance; and often amounts to a virtual usurpation of the throne of Christ, who claims, as one of his highest prerogatives, to be Lord of the conscience! Compare Romans xiv. and James iv. 11—12. Hence it will be evident how utterly incapacitating such a frame of mind must be for fellowship with God: nor need we wonder that St. Paul, towards the close of his epistle to the Romans, should have directed them to the real author of schism, as being Satan himself, the 'prime disturber of the universe.'

'Entering the sacred inclosure,—the paradise of the new creation,—he early sowed the seeds of dissension, and effected another fall of man. Aware that the conversion of the world is suspended on the unity of the church, he leaves no means untried, and no agency unemployed, which is likely, by embroiling the church, to frustrate its design, and to prolong his possession of the world. While, by the same means, the church has often been rendered an easy conquest to the world: and short of this, has furnished it with sport, and even awakened emotions mingled with pity and contempt.' pp. 176, 7.

In a word, the religious intellect, practical judgment, personal piety, spiritual enjoyment, a sense of our own common interests,

scriptural union, brotherly love, removal of differences,—one and all are affected by an indulgence in the sin of schism. Mr. Harris also remarks, with much truth, that wherever a spirit of party appears, we may be sure that the spirit of calumny is not far distant. Schism germinates the sect of slanderers; of men who listen to, and repeat again the imperfections of their opponents; until their swallow for such sort of food has become enormous, if their appetite for it be not insatiable. In this way, credulity grows into a loadstone of lies: and the fear of misrepresentation, thus produced, is highly unfavourable to the removal of denominational evils, or the introduction of ecclesiastical improvements. It moreover dishonours Christianity in the eyes of the world, confirms the irreligious in their impiety, proves an impediment to the sincere inquirers after truth, makes sectarianism pass for vitality in religion, arrests the cause of national education, enfeebls missionary efforts, delays the conversion of the world, and, above all things—it grieves the Holy Spirit of God. The various pleas and disguises of schism, however, are so numerous, that our author devotes to them his eighth chapter.

He therein opens up, with much quiet irony, the grand mistake of those who sometimes, without being quite aware of it, maintain in effect that schism may, after all, not be so very bad a thing; since it leads to a division of labour, and perhaps wholesome rivalry. Another excuse for disunion is the assertion often made, that unanimity of sentiment is essential to union, since without it the apparent concord would be real hypocrisy: but, as we have already seen, the oneness of heart, required by scripture from true Christians, by no means involves the abolition of circumstantial differences. Perfect harmony is compatible with the most engaging variety; and in this point of view, the object desired is, that the rainbow round about the throne in the apocalypse may find its antitype in the union even upon earth of a countless number of all people, dominions, and languages, concentrating their faith, love, and energies, on the cross and sacrifice of the Son of God! With respect to such as would inquire whether any degree of truth is to be sacrificed in upholding union, Mr. Harris replies:—

‘ We have to remind the objector, that there is a wide difference between denouncing schism and asking for the sacrifice of truth. If we could present him with no alternative between schism and uniformity,—if we were to propose perfect unanimity of opinion instead of unanimity of affection,—he would then have ground for repeating and urging his objection. But let him observe first, a truth which we have often repeated already—that we do not ask him to sacrifice his opinions, but only his unchristian bigotry. We do not ask the Independent to become an Episcopalian, nor the Episcopalian to become an Independent. We do not ask the Calvinist to change sides with

the Arminian, nor the Baptist with the Pædo-baptist: but only to exchange the visible expressions of that love, which they ought mutually to cherish, as heirs together of the grace of life. We have to remind him, secondly, that by maintaining his present position, he most likely is sacrificing the truth, in more senses than one; while by maintaining the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, he would be vindicating and magnifying the truth. At present, he is saying in effect, 'The grand doctrines of salvation are nothing as a basis of Christian union, unless their reception be accompanied by certain shades of opinion which I myself have adopted; the fact that God hath received him into his favour, is no argument why I should receive him into communion, although inspired authority has affirmed that it is, unless he will consent to adopt every tittle of my creed:'—and thus the truth, as it is in Jesus, is reduced to a level with the truth as it is in a party. Whereas, by making those doctrines the ground of Christian union, he would be exalting them before the eyes of the world, and proclaiming, that so great and glorious are they in his estimation, that every thing else appears comparatively little. At present, he is sacrificing truth, also, by indulging his attachment to particular shades of opinion, at the expense of all that large portion of the Bible, which inculcates love to the brethren. He is putting contempt on the truth, by putting contempt on the brotherhood. He is disparaging so large and vital a portion of the Bible, that if he persists in sacrificing it, even though he retain every other part, he is endangering his salvation. 'I,' said Baxter,—and the sentiment was worthy the inspired pen of the seraphic John,—'I can as willingly be a martyr for *love* as for any article of my creed.' But in his infatuated zeal for a punctilio or a party, the objector appears utterly to forget that there is such an article as love in his creed, or such a doctrine as love in the Bible. He defends some little angle or ornament in the temple of truth, at the expense of one of the pillars. He contends for the *letter*, or rather, perhaps, for *a* letter of the truth, in a way which tramples on the spirit which pervades the whole. Whereas, thirdly, we have to remind him that by cultivating catholic fellowship, he would be not merely not sacrificing the truth, not merely maintaining it, but most likely promoting his own peculiar view of it. He might still inculcate those views from the pulpit and the press, and recommend them by the amiable influence of his example; for controversy itself may be so conducted as to win esteem, instead of alienating it. Love is a key, which would afford him the readiest and the surest access to the hearts and consciences of others. If his peculiar views are scriptural, as they came down at first from the calm region of heaven, so their self-recommending excellence is more likely to be seen and appreciated in the serene atmosphere of peace, than in any other. And as the whole system of revealed truth originated in the love which compassionated our fatal ignorance, is he not likely to be more successful in propagating it, the more he inculcates it in the spirit in which it was first conceived?' pp. 208—210.

In the ninth chapter, on the kind of union to be attempted, we have the proposition pressed upon us, that the divisions of the

church are not to be perpetual ; that the period must arrive in the lapse of time, when the first movement towards the necessary oneness will be made ; and that it is neither unreasonable nor hopeless to attempt that movement now. Our author, however, cautions us against setting the standard of union too high,—re-marking that protracted disagreement has disqualified the church for an immediate perfection of concord, without a miracle ; and that therefore we must probably be content for the present with making approximations to it,—‘gratefully accepting every return ‘to each other, as a proof that God is graciously returning to us.’ He then shows, that having erected such a standard as may be practicable, we must not expect that any one party will concede more than ourselves in order to meet it : nor should we imagine that Christian union must necessarily follow, as day succeeds night, upon certain changes taking place in ecclesiastical affairs. The blessed Spirit is alone the source of love and effective agreement. Nor need we be disheartened or deterred from our endeavours by former failures. Our duty is simply to go forward with the olive-branch in our hands, under a calm, deep, and definite sense of our duty to God, and of the pressing energies of his church in the world. The union itself, in order to be permanent, *must be founded on the supreme and sole authority of the inspired Word, as well as on the inalienable right of private judgment.* The supremacy of the one, and the liberty of the other, can no more be invaded or trifled with, consistently we mean with any union answering to its name and purpose, than the great laws of centripetal and centrifugal forces in creation could be disturbed without affecting the planetary revolutions. The second essential requisite to the proposed object is *a substantial oneness of faith ;* with a belief in the gospel, as being chiefly valuable, *so far as it renews the heart, and forms the character to holiness.* Such an association would of course be cemented by brotherly love, which, discovering itself in appropriate acts and expressions, must render the union *visible* to the world. Unanimity of heart would infallibly produce unanimity of action in the Christian cause. ‘Like the friendly provinces of the same continent, ‘speaking the same language, living in allegiance to the same ‘sovereign, and engaged in mutual and general traffic, the church ‘would present one scene of spiritual commerce, carried on chiefly ‘for the advantage of the world, and visible to the universe. ‘God would bless us, and all the ends of the world would fear ‘him.’

We now hasten to the tenth chapter, on the way in which union should be sought. The attempts hitherto made to preserve or restore unity Mr. Harris considers to have presented one or more of these three characters :—either they have employed the principle of coercion—or they have relied upon argumentative discussion—or

they have projected the catholic plan of uniting on the grand basis of evangelical doctrine, in which we already agree, with the understanding that mutual forbearance is to be exercised as to subordinate matters. Of the two former, history relates enough: the third alone remains to be tried, and, thank God, it is the scriptural plan. Most, if not all our author's subdivisions in this section of his work, may be summed up in that saying of the apostle, 'Let us not love in word only, but also in deed and in truth.' His remarks upon moderation, forbearance, patience, and prayer for the effusion of the Spirit, are invaluable; as are also those upon the importance of all evangelical ministers looking upon themselves as the appointed peace-makers of the Christian church.

His last chapter, the eleventh, enumerates many motives and arguments for laying the subject, as he has now done, before the religious public: such as, that as the obligation to Christian union is perpetual, so the obligation of enforcing it is perpetual also. His appeal is made to the faithful of Christ Jesus of every community. He reminds us, that while science can boast of her catholicity, the followers of the Prince of Peace ought no longer, were it only for very shame, to disturb the political quiet of the country by their broils. He dwells upon the evident fitness of unity, and its consequent agreeableness to the blessed Trinity in Unity; reminding his readers that the church owes her existence to their infinite love. Not only would this union augment the capability of all Christians, both individually and collectively, for usefulness; but it would also increase their capacity for the reception and operations of that Holy Spirit, who alone can crown their activity with success. God is employing them all, *so far as their divisions permit*; and according to the amount of their piety and zeal, is impartially blessing them all. Such an union, as that proposed by our author, would not fail to strike the world with awe, and affect the public heart; whilst, on the other hand, their divisions are depriving them of all that happiness, which the fruits of their harmony would produce in the final judgment, and throughout everlasting ages beyond it. The only extract we can find room for is the following:—

'And are our divisions thus casting their shadows forwards into eternity? Are they not only impairing our usefulness and happiness now, but even threatening to dim the lustre of the crown which shall be assigned us then? And for *what*? Who is to be the gainer? What is the compensation? When is it to accrue? Assemble the church and inquire. Surely, if an advantage is ever to result, it must by this time have appeared. Fifteen hundred years have been allowed to try the merits of division. Summon the various parties, and learn what these merits are. Alas! some of them are embroiled too deeply to obey the call. And of those that do, some refuse to approach, lest

they should be contaminated by the touch of another denomination ; while the rest, estranged from each other, exhibit signs of mutual jealousy and distrust. And is this the religion of love, in praise of whose fraternal and sympathetic spirit, inspiration prepared its loftiest strains ? How has its gracious spirit evaporated ! and whither has it fled ? Is this the church which was to advance like a bannered host, carrying with her the sympathies of the groaning creation, gathering up trophies at every step, and returning at length from the circuit and conquest of the world, laden with many crowns for Him, who had caused her to triumph in every place ? Is this the body which was to be made one, by the inhabiting and all-pervading Spirit ; and of whose unity the most intimate and compacted objects in creation were considered the most appropriate emblems ? Alas ! that body is so dislocated, dismembered, and mangled, that it has become another vision of dry bones ; and another resurrection, which shall bring bone to his bone, is alone adequate to its condition ! And was it for this that Divinity and Humanity met in the person of the Son of God ? Was it for this he bowed his head upon the cross, and died to show that God was Love ? Was it for this that he instituted a church, prayed for its unity, endowed it with his Spirit, and gave to it the field of the world for the scene of its triumphs ? Our hearts *feel* that it was not. All the unreclaimed, neglected, perishing portions of the world, protest that it was not. Shame, equal shame, on the Jews who crucified the Son of God, and on Christians, who, in the person of his members, have for ages been crucifying him afresh, and are still putting him to an open shame. Blessed Saviour, we need that thou shouldst add to the prayer for the unity of thy disciples, the prayer for thy murderers—‘ Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.’ pp. 298—301.

Such is the Essay upon Union, which we cordially recommend to our readers. It appears to us as more than worth all the schemes of comprehension that have ever been propounded, or all the henoticons or concordats that have ever been imagined. The views delineated by our author are taken from Calvary rather than Sinai ; and have therefore for their affecting characteristic the saying of our Saviour, ‘ And I, if I be lifted up, will draw ‘ all men unto me.’ We venture to think, however, that there is a chapter still wanted, for the development of those processes, by which it may probably please Providence, since supernatural manifestations have been withdrawn, to effect his purposes of union in the world. Our friends will not for a moment suppose, that in saying this, we pretend to dethrone the Holy Spirit from his absolute supremacy and omnipotence ; on the contrary, they will give us credit, we trust, for a desire to put more abundant honours upon his divine influences, by preparing the machinery for their distribution and operation, simply because he has commanded us to do so, having placed the church, in these latter days, under a dispensation of means, rather than one of miracles. The

modus operandi, then, speaking merely after the manner of men, would, as it strikes us, have afforded materials in the hands of a pious and gifted person, like Mr. Harris, for a most important portion of his treatise. The grand instrument, in the present age, of gathering souls into the fold of Christ, is the word of God, read or preached, and applied to the soul by the almighty Author of regeneration, not in the letter, but in the power. Yet it is admitted that there is a certain evil, amongst several others indeed, but, like Saul, higher than any of the rest by at least a head and shoulders, which neutralizes, in ten thousand cases, the efficiency of the agent employed; and this is termed schism. Now let us only further admit, what cannot, we conceive, be disputed, that in our quarter of christendom there is an institution 'which has paved the temple of God with beaten gold, so as to prevent persons,' as Mr. H. somewhere intimates, 'from lifting up their eyes to the beatific vision;' which has set up one denomination above others, and so enthroned it by the side of the state, that not only must jealousy be the inevitable consequence as to kindred communities, but secularity must be as certainly diffused through every rank and class of the exalted sect itself, from its singular position and circumstances;—what, we ask, would be the conclusion of the Christian philosopher on the subject? Why, in treating upon the concord of the faithful, the eye of his mind would rest at once upon an institution so injurious. Should there, at the same time, subsist any doubt in his inner man as to the correctness of the supposed premises, he would perhaps go first amongst the pious members of that institution, and ascertain for himself whether they really contended that their denomination ought *not* to be placed upon a perfect level with other orthodox Protestants for example; and whether their professions and publications at all pleaded guilty to, or bewailed the prevalence of worldliness in their own body. The pamphlets of one John Search, entitled 'What—and who says it?' might abridge his labours in this matter! In the magnitude of his own philanthropy, he has conceived a project for the ministers of evangelical communions occasionally exchanging pulpits;—and what prevents his noble conception from being anything more, with regard to Episcopalians in this country, than an utopia upon paper, but this identical institution? The Moravians, it may be replied, form an exception; but there will still remain the established clergy of the ten thousand four hundred parishes in England and Wales; besides those of eleven hundred parishes in Ireland! Let us imagine, however, that some rector or vicar, dependent upon an ample benefice, may have resolved to meet Mr. Harris, and realize in their instances his benevolent design: then what follows? His diocesan, as a consistent prelate of the institution in

question, suspends the reverend liberal ; whose rank and influence are thus annihilated ; his fortunes crushed ; and, to all intents and purposes, *quoad* his former conscientious associations, he becomes an excommunicated person ! The Establishment, in other words, mars the union, and makes a martyr into the bargain. Or let us suppose that a clergyman, watched by some right reverend Argus full of eyes and ears for all anti-conservative tendencies amongst the priests and deacons, or more particularly the curates, committed to his charge,—we say, suppose such a clergyman attending the Lord's Supper, for the sake of union, at some dissenting chapel,—and what follows ? A single fact may furnish the best answer, which occurred but the other day ; when an active bishop withdrew his license from a young minister, because the feet of his wife occasionally strayed into a neighbouring Wesleyan conventicle !

The sum and substance, therefore, of the argument brings us to this ; that we must deal practically as well as theoretically with the institution before us. We are not either speaking or writing against men, or bodies of men ; but only against systems : and our author can scarcely help perceiving, that in order to attain his object, there must be an abolition of the alliance between the church and state. The Act of Uniformity, together with all that it involves, was and is neither more nor less than an act against the union of all faithful Christians, prepared by a profligate monarch and his minions, and passed with the most cordial consent and sanction of the devil and his angels ! The clergy of the Establishment can hardly be blamed for acting as they do under their circumstances. Those circumstances must be altered. They, like other men, are the creatures of a system, which being found, by painful experience, to produce mischief, should be modified or abolished with as little delay, and as much consideration for the less guilty parties, as possible. True moreover it is, that even conceiving this already done, the union desired may by possibility still not be attained. The Spirit of God may be grieved in various ways ; and his influences being withheld or withdrawn, the severance of episcopacy from the state would not, we acknowledge, *ex necessitate*, lead to a hearty and scriptural oneness of affection between Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists : but it must also be remembered, that while that alliance lasts, the proposed union is altogether *in nubibus*, according to our apprehensions of the matter. Any church whatsoever, evangelical as it may be, which is doomed to the embraces and co-partnership of a secular government, is without doubt, spiritually speaking, in the position of a living individual chained to a dead or dying body. The demand must be for separation ; not that life is altogether secured by it, since mortal disease may have

commenced in the person respecting whose preservation there is any hope; yet without such severance, every sensible spectator perceives in both instances that death is unavoidable!

Our readers may rest assured that these remarks are not thrown out for any factious purposes; but that they are our deliberate opinions, after a careful perusal of 'Union,' with every desire that its sacred sentiments may be transubstantiated into our own minds. Nonconformists perhaps will generally coincide with us; or, at all events, they will forbear to impugn the last statement. But not so, we fear, will nine-tenths of our Episcopalian friends either feel or express themselves; and yet from them also are we affectionately desirous of gaining an audience. Immense allowances, we are well aware, must be made, and we are ready to make them, for associations strongly rooted. Prejudice itself is always more respectable than flippancy or pertness. We would, however, claim their attention to the increasing numbers within their peculiar pale, who are beginning to open their eyes and protest against all religious establishments whatsoever; whilst, at the same time, they remain as attached to the general doctrines and order of what is called the Church of England, as any dissenters in the kingdom can be to nonconformity. They have no doubt been led to their present opinions, by those vital grievances admitted on all sides to exist within the limits of their own communion. And are not the chief amongst these, the absence of discipline—the presence of secularity—the evils of ungodly patronage—the occasional sanction given to downright heterodoxy or popery;—as witness the columns of the *Record* newspaper—the pious breathings of every evangelical Episcopalian publication of this country—the formation of societies to purchase preferment, or educate hopeful aspirants at Oxford or Cambridge—and last, though not least, the monthly and annual meetings of certain dignitaries and gentlemen, who assemble in Bartlett's Buildings for the promotion of Christian knowledge? Why cannot the clergyman of a parish exercise over his people that sort of oversight which a Baptist or Methodist minister can maintain with regard to their respective congregations? The reply, after much circumlocution, must terminate in a practical admission, that it is, because his church happens to be an established one! What other results can ensue, than those which have occurred for the last two hundred years and upwards, as to the pastorate, both in England and Ireland, when its bishops are nominated by the premier of the day—made lords of parliament, often, of course, for political purposes—and the scandal of the entire practice simultaneously acknowledged in the forms and mockery of a *congé d'elire*? Are grapes to be gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles? Let us solemnly and respectfully put such questions to our hearts and consciences as these:—

How was it, that the recent revival of real religion in the Church of England met with general discountenance, and frequent persecution, from the hands of the hierarchy? How was it, that the first bishops, who dared to support the British and Foreign Bible Society, were looked upon as speckled birds on the bench, amongst those fathers in God, whose lawn sleeves inflated with additional plenitude and stiffness at the intrusion of Methodism into our cathedrals? How is it, that many a noble parish sanctuary, throughout the land, stands open on the Sunday with gaping doors and nearly empty pews, whilst the adjacent chapel, provided with an evangelical preacher, shall be full to overflowing? What has been the general spirit and conduct of opulent prelates in high places—of clergymen in the commission of the peace—of collegiate bodies in our populous cities—or of the universities of the country? We grant that public opinion has improved them all in many respects; but has this amelioration occurred *through* an Establishment, or in the teeth of it? Neither the one nor the other, answers, perhaps, a pious and sincere Episcopalian; but through the Spirit of God. We agree with him as to his acknowledgment of its primary source; yet how came that blessed Paraclete to have withheld his influences through so many generations? It surely goes to demonstrate no striking approbation of a system which suffered six millions and a half of Roman Catholics to grow up in Ireland, and more than half the population of England to remain a spiritual wilderness, had it not been for the exertions of Protestant dissenters? We put these queries not to irritate, but to alarm; not for the sake of triumphing, but to guide inquiry into the path of truth. The spirit of the Church of England, as embodied in the mass of her services and doctrines, is one thing; the spirit of an Establishment is another. The former we hold to be, for the most part, holy, pure, peaceable, and friendly to union with all those who love Jesus Christ in the gospel: the latter is *in its essence opposed to union*, being secular, selfish, and domineering; its episcopacy degenerates into prelacy; its vestiges of popery, left unremoved by our reformers, are clung to with all possible tenacity, because they are connected with the purple and fine linen of its connexion with the state; and its conduct towards sister churches is just that of Laud, in the seventeenth century, persecuting as far as it has power; having ‘horns like a lamb, but speaking like a dragon.’ We trust, before a very long period shall have elapsed, to see petitions upon petitions addressed to the legislature, from our Episcopalian brethren, soliciting a repeal of the Act of Uniformity—the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords—the dissolution of unscriptural tests, oaths, and subscriptions—the acknowledgment of no other head of the church than her Lord and Redeemer—the reformation of the entire system of patronage—the abolition of

consecrated oblations, ampullas, spurs, swords, rings, orbs, crucial unctions, and similar mummeries at all future coronations—as well as the extinction of every other species of popish trumpery, which stands in the way of union between sensible christians of all evangelical denominations. Then shall the path be made plain for faithful shepherds of every living church under heaven to range themselves, with one heart and one mind, under the cross of their High Priest and Master; who will send them out into the world, with new vigour for its conquest, as a host of faithful soldiers, ‘looking forth in the brightness of the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.’

- Art. VII. 1. *First Report of the British and Foreign Aborigines Society.* 1838.
2. *Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to inquire into the State of the Aboriginal Tribes in British Settlements; reprinted, with Comments by the Aborigines Protection Society.* Ball. 1838.
3. *Regulations and Public Address of the British and Foreign Aborigines Protection Society.* 1837.

THE Aborigines Protection Society prefers powerful claims to public support. It has existed for some time, though as yet but little known,—a fact sufficiently accounted for by the prior occupation of philanthropists, with the gigantic evils connected with Colonial Apprenticeship. This obstruction is now happily removed, by the signal success with which a gracious Providence has crowned the labours of his servants. The Colonial bondsman is at length invested with the common rights of manhood, and his friends are consequently free to direct their energies to some other and kindred pursuit. We avail ourselves of the earliest opportunity to indicate what that pursuit should be, and shall watch with deep solicitude the result of our appeal. The Society whose publications we have placed at the head of our article, requires but the exertion of ordinary care on the part of its founders, to become an instrument of great good; and which, happily for the cause they advocate, is relieved from the difficulties commonly attendant on the machinery of important undertakings during their early years of struggle and trial. This we say is most happy, inasmuch, as every hour's delay in vindicating that cause, is permitted at a grievous amount of suffering, and a frightful sacrifice of human life. This society is designated *the British and*

Foreign Aborigines Protection Society; and its character and probable usefulness were illustrated by several able speeches made at its first anniversary, on the 16th of May last. These speeches appeared at considerable length, with the first report verbatim, in the 'Sun' newspaper of the 18th of May; and the report has been recently republished. The title of the society explains its objects, which is sought to be attained by collecting information from all parts of the world, upon whatever materially affects uncivilized tribes of men in their intercourse with white people; and by making that information known to the public through the press; or to the government and parliament, by personal appeals, whenever redress of their grievances, or improvement in the laws and administrations concerning them may be needed. The correction of evils that now oppress all the coloured races, and the extension of benefits now conferred upon any of them, constitute the business of this society so far as its influence can be carried; and as it is to work mainly through the influence of opinion, there can be very little doubt, that if wisely guided, it will rapidly and steadily obtain general favour. This society, indeed, is scarcely new to the public even in form; and its objects have long been under the serious contemplation of so many worthy and eminent persons, that, with prudent activity, its efforts for the relief of uncivilized millions, now known to be suffering from ages of ill-regulated colonization, will excite general sympathy; and it will not fail of receiving from the least expected quarters zealous co-operation in every well-conceived measure, to secure those millions a happier future. In fact the time is come, when the good seed sown by a few individuals in the last century—not to go back to a more remote period—is fast producing rich harvests. One of these harvests, *the Abolition of British Colonial Slavery*, is almost gathered in; and the incomparable men who first advocated that cause; the Granville Sharpes of Britain, and the Benezets of France and America; were quite as earnest protectors of the *free* coloured races as they were determined vindicators of freedom for negro slaves. It must be remembered, that on this subject the same spirit is abroad which in the time of the Commonwealth prompted the puritans to raise the then large sum of £7000 by parochial collections to found the New England Company,* for the instruction of Indians under Eliot; and *that spirit is now a hundredfold more intense, and incomparably more ably guided.*

* Mr. Hume lately moved in the House of Commons for the accounts of this company; and he was met by the strange assertion, that the money thus raised by the people was given to a *private* body, which owes no responsibility to parliament.

This advanced state of opinion in favour of the claims of the coloured races should be well understood, in order to form a sound judgment of the influence which the Aborigines Protection Society may *forthwith* exercise, to stop the carnage now afflicting all the colonies in turn. It will, therefore, be useful to recapitulate a few leading circumstances which show the society's advantageous position in this respect.

The gigantic work of *abolishing negro slavery* has of late absorbed public attention to the exclusion of its kindred subject, *justice to the free-coloured people*, only as the *abolition of the slave trade*, preceded that of slavery in British colonies. From the first, slavery and injustice to the free blacks were seen to be branches of one wide spread evil, *oppression springing from prejudice of colour*; and this again, a mighty branch of a greater evil, *oppression inflicted by the strong upon the weak* from time immemorial, and throughout the whole human family without distinction of race. Not only was Granville Sharpe a friend to the free Omai, whilst he hazarded an estate in vindicating at law the rights of the slave Somerset; and not only did that admirable man by an appeal to parliament, stop for a while the military execution of the free Caribbs of St. Vincent's, whilst he was amongst the few first founders of an anti-slavery committee—but the great advocates of the anti-slavery cause of every other class even when fighting the particular battle of the slave, also took up the larger ground of universal justice to all coloured people. In 1792, Mr. Pitt placed the abolition of the slave-trade in the true light, when he declared that *the civilization of Africa* was the leading feature of the question and he gave it the right character when he illustrated the prospects of the African by referring to the 'savage' manners of the Britons under the domination of Rome, anticipating for all Africa, a future career of calm industry, a legitimate and beneficial commerce, advancement in the arts and philosophy, and the cheering life of pure religion,* as consequences of the abolition of the slave-trade. Although the lawyers, generally, were adverse to abolition,† Bentham, the ally of Wilberforce in that cause, found somewhat later in the sufferings of the

* On the abolition of the slave-trade, April 2nd, 1792. This is the speech on which Mr. Wilberforce says,—'Windham, who bears no love to Pitt, tells me that Fox and Grey agreed with him in thinking Pitt's speech one of the most extraordinary displays of eloquence they ever heard. For the last twenty minutes he really seemed to be inspired. He was dilating on the *future prospects of civilizing Africa, a topic which I had suggested to him in the morning.*'—Life of Wilberforce, vol. ii. p. 346.

† The bar were all against us. Fox could scarcely prevent Erskine from making a set speech in favour of the trade.—ib. vol. i. p. 293.

aboriginal inhabitants of New South Wales from convicts, a most powerful argument against transportation, when the government of that day subjected those aborigines, along with the negro Indians and all other native tribes to a common system of oppression. Men of letters were early converts to the better opinions,* and about this period, Campbell, a brilliant representative of the poetical genius of Britain, then in the youthful freshness of his great powers, embraced the whole eastern, and western, and southern world, the Hindoo, the Red Indian, the African, and the South Sea Islander, in his glorious aspirations after better times, when all the wrongs and sorrows of the oppressed coloured tribes should cease. In 1812, the transportation committee of the House of Commons, with Romilly amongst its members, appealed warmly, although in vain, on behalf of the cruelly treated Australians. Not long before, sympathy was successfully roused by a document published in an English newspaper in favour of the persecuted *free* Hottentots; and in 1822, Wilberforce, in the same spirit which ever guided him, stimulated the ministers to extend protection to that people as well as to the slaves of South Africa; and so to save them at once from oppression and barbarism. Still more recently the cause of the free black, and brown, and red man, somewhat neglected, but never forgotten by philanthropists, has been resumed by Mr. Buxton, a leading friend to the slave.

Pending such somewhat isolated, and often casual efforts of the *lay* friends of the free coloured tribes, which, however prove, that their cause was far from being entirely lost sight of, the missionaries were slowly, but unceasingly, raising up defences for it in various colonies, in the face of many discouragements. The official authorities, whom they watched, were for the most part jealous of them; and the *portions* of the colonists whom they checked, unwisely depreciated and opposed them. But many exceptions among both public officers and colonists, show that if the home government will be impartial and active, the most interested classes may be expected to become just. The regular publication of missionary reports has spread the knowledge of important details with success among their steadily increasing bodies† of contributors, of whom many are colonists.

* In 'Horace Walpole's Letters,' there is a fine passage, proving that he felt all the horrors of negro slavery when it was a settled thing among us, and Granville Sharpe had scarcely begun his labours of half a century.

† The increase may be inferred from the following facts:

The Baptist Missionary Society, founded in 1792							Increase in 1837	£15,000
The London	ditto	ditto	ditto	1794	ditto	ditto	£71,335	
The Church	ditto	ditto	ditto	1800	ditto	ditto	£84,000	
The Wesleyan	ditto	ditto remodelled in 1815			ditto	ditto	£81,735	

In addition to these special demonstrations of interest, the successful agitation of the abolition of the slave-trade and of slavery, has raised numerous topics, by which the public mind has become familiarized to the opinion that coloured races are fully capable of civilization; a hypothesis to which ample justice has been done by the travellers* of the last seventy years in uncivilized lands.

These things show, that *the Aborigines Protection Society* may reasonably depend upon receiving immediate support, through the active sympathy of a large and enlightened body,—men and women, who will come to this branch of the general cause the more earnestly, as their intelligence and zeal will have been proved in their successful struggle on behalf of the slave. There is proof, also, which it is of especial importance to adduce, that such support may be obtained by the society from another quarter, where a decided change in favour of the coloured races is taking place. This is occurring amongst the hundreds of thousands of our countrymen who are in the act of becoming colonists, and amongst their friends at home; and the change is of special importance, inasmuch, as at the time of its occurrence, colonization is taking a character in a great measure new, and it will soon, probably, be conducted upon principles, and on a scale calculated to throw even our own former colonial enterprises into the shade. In the last twenty-four years, the number of emigrants has increased from an average of 5000 a-year, the amount during the ten first years, after the general peace, to 20,000 a-year, during the five years, ending 1831, and to 70,000 a-year in the last five years; and of 694,969, who have emigrated in the last thirteen years, 433,818 have gone in the last six years.* This increase, too, is likely to prove the *beginning* only of a still more wonderful augmentation of the number of colonial emigrants. A great future field, Australia east, north, west, and south is scarcely yet opened; and in one colony there, New South Wales, the provision of means of emigration in the sale of crown lands, has already in five years sprung from £13,000 to £130,000 per annum.

With such a prospect of the rapid transfer of the wilderness to a new race of men, it is a consolatory fact, that these prosperous settlers may be expected to go forth with improved sentiments towards the aboriginal possessors of the soil. It is these improved sentiments, and the measures which they have dictated, that constitute the change referred to; and undeniable documents attest that it has really begun to take place.

* The names of Sparrman, Le Vaillant, Barrow, Thompson, and Pringle, in the example of South Africa alone, will readily occur to all readers of foreign travels, in proof of the assertion in the text.

† House of Commons Papers, for 1838, No. 388.

The first improvements to be met with in modern colonization on this head, are the *promises* made in favour of the natives by the Commissioners for the new colony of South Australia. This has been followed up in the present year by the better *bill* for colonizing New Zealand; and although neither the *promised* guarantees of the South Australia commissioners, nor the New Zealand Association's specified measures, accomplish so much as the safety of the aborigines demands, they are both incomparably superior to any scheme of colonization ever planned, not excepting even William Penn's. It is almost superfluous to add, that they leave the system of the colonial office at an unmeasurable distance behind. For example, no attempt has been made in either case to change our law, which *prevents* the natives giving evidence, except *on oath*; and as they have no form of oath in their *own law*, they can never be witnesses in our courts—an evil which daily produces ruinous effects to them in all the colonies. What sort of a chance would the people of Yorkshire have of justice in courts of law, and consequently of advancement in civilization, if they were prohibited to give evidence in any litigated case? Yet all the natives of Australia, all the New Zealanders, all the Indians of America, and all the South Africans, who happen not to be Christians,—and among them the converts are few—are in this deplorable case. The report of the Aborigines Protection Society notices the fact, but the Commons' Committee neglected it.

In the South Australian case, provision is promised for obtaining land from the natives by treaty; for reserving one-fifth of it for their use; for protecting them by a special agent; for making their subsistence a charge on the new colony; for instructing them; for building asylums for them; and for taking means to teach them habits of industry. The New Zealand bill besides securing most of these points, has a provision of great importance for the relative comfort and respectability of the native chiefs during their difficult progress towards civilization. Before colonies were contemplated for South Australia and New Zealand, the government had the sole administration of this department, without affording, to the last moment the most insignificant means for civilising the natives. How little, indeed, the government has shared the improvement of public opinion on this subject, is demonstrated by the case of all the colonies in Australia, where official power is complete, and popular control a nullity. Nevertheless at the Swan River down to almost the last intelligence, the most atrocious disregard of the rights of humanity was proclaimed in the government orders;* and the new settlement of 1838, is founded near Melville Island without a single legislative guarantee in favour of the

* Government order of July, 1837.

natives, whose remembrance of our former occupation of their country is replete with images of horror.*

The cause of the improvement in the South Australian and New Zealand cases, is, that private parties have, in a great degree, caught the good spirit of the times, whilst the Ministers of the crown have adhered to former prejudices, unless when particular influences compelled a change. It may, therefore, be asserted with truth, that the parties to such colonies, abroad and at home, are likely to become valuable administrators of any *good new system that may be devised in favour of the aborigines.*

In this state of the question, it is obvious that a society specially devoted to its discussion, and to the coloured tribes in and near the colonies, has taken upon itself what will justly be held to be a grave trust, for the due discharge of which a solemn account will be required; and so far from meeting with lukewarmness in the public, the Society is exposed to some hazard of disappointing not only the sanguine, but even the calmest friends of the cause which its members have voluntarily put themselves forward to defend. The religious and scientific public have already acquired a large acquaintance with the subject; and the men of business begin to understand it. They who maintain that it is the *destiny* of coloured to be destroyed by white people, have lost the power they once had of stifling the common principles of justice, so as to realize their theory by making the intercourse between the two races destructive to the weaker. Assuredly, then, the expectation that something can be speedily effected to carry those common principles of justice into practice is general and strong; and the knowledge of all who publicly advocate this weighty cause ought to be proportionably accurate and extensive; their minds free from any undue bias; and their activity unwearied in order successfully to meet its great difficulties.

A brief examination of the documents published by the Society will show in what degree it is likely to accomplish the task it has undertaken.

In the first place, its general scheme is admirable. To become exactly acquainted with the truth as to what is doing in the colonies, and wherever civilized men are in communication with the uncivilized; and to make the truth public, would alone go far towards remedying nine-tenths of the errors committed and wrongs done there. One of the speakers at the late Anniversary, the Rev. Thomas Binney, said well, in reference to this leading feature of the Society's proceedings, that it was of paramount importance *to keep an eye* on all home and colonial proceedings by which the happiness and interest of the Aborigines are affected, and so, to carry the power of public opinion abroad.

* See 'Voyage Round the World,' by Dr. Wilson, 1835.

The report too insists with honest energy on *the ill consequence of facts being now concealed, or coloured by interested parties in and out of the government.* Hence, it adds truly, *the existence of that apathy in the public mind, which could not prevail if the publicity were allowed, that ought never to be denied.* An extensive correspondence with all parts of the world, and personal communication in London with people of colour, and others who have visited uncivilized tribes, together with the legislative proceedings which may be adopted, will soon supply a mass of valuable materials, which it seems a part of the Society's plan to publish in various forms. Such publications in a regular journal, will be looked for with anxiety by all who know how indispensable it is to have correct and full information, *quick enough upon the occurrence of remote events to obtain general attention whilst their interest is urgent, and before an erroneous course of policy has been adopted by the government in consequence of the PUBLIC being ignorant of facts.* When the public shall be regularly informed of what is reported to the government, there will be a far better prospect than at present, that the measures of our rulers will be in accordance with sound principles, and be justified by the real state of colonial affairs. Curious, and scarcely credible facts to confirm these remarks, are disclosed in the first three pages of the very last parliamentary volume of papers on South Africa. By the House of Commons' papers for 1837, No. 503, pp. 1—3, it appears in Lord Glenelg's own despatch, dated March, 1836, that on a frontier which has given rise to as much discussion as that between Holland and Belgium, namely, on the eastern frontier of the Cape of Good Hope, there are '*numerous settlements, of the existence of which,*' the Secretary of State says, '*HE WAS NOT APPRIZED;*' although it appears that some of them were included in a regular magistracy so long ago as the year 1813, and others of them were expressly sanctioned by despatches from Downing-street. Yet the destruction of these settlements was ordered in the famous despatch of the 26th of December, 1835, which is the subject of panegyric from the Aborigines Protection Society; and in other points the praise is merited. Mere accident only, saved the colony from the indescribable embarrassments which such an order, arriving in South Africa at such a conjuncture, must have occasioned. A new governor happened to be in London, whose previous local experience, and *attentive reading of despatches IN THE COLONIAL OFFICE,* enabled him to give Lord Glenelg intelligence, the hearing of which must have made his ears tingle. Counter-orders were accordingly sent off, and with characteristic carelessness, to correct the mischief if possible. But the warning was given in vain as to a most important part of the matter. Mr. Stockenstrom, the Governor, who was in London, to refer the Secretary of

State to 'a despatch *from* the Colonial office,' seriously and not sarcastically mentions his own 'attempt,' in 1834, to awaken the government to the alarming condition of the interior, in consequence of the emigration of Cape colonists; and now again in 1836, as the Commissioners of Inquiry, and others had done before,* he points out their probable collision with the natives, which it was *fearful to contemplate*. But the government was not to be awakened, and in 1837 and 1838, the storm has burst with awful fury over the devoted land.† The printing such despatches speedily after their being written would cause them to be read more profitably; and the Aborigines Protection Society will deserve general support if it execute its plan of giving us 'cheap publications' on this branch of colonial affairs.

On another capital point the Society is right, in making a most wise and valuable declaration in favour of British colonization—not indeed as now managed, but such as it may become. 'It seems to be an opinion founded rather on experience,' says the Report, 'than on any essential principle in the nature of the case, that the coloured races must inevitably perish as civilization and Christianity advance. Whatever past facts may be, and unquestionably they are painful enough, they are not evidence that no better scheme of colonization can be found compatible with the safety and improvement of the Aborigines. We cannot admit the doctrine that the establishment of a civilized community in the neighbourhood of uncivilized tribes, *must* be injurious to the latter, without supposing something extremely defective and improper in the regulations and principles of the former. LET THESE BE CORRECTED, and THE EVILS *MUST BE DIMINISHED.*'

The announcement of this opinion is important at the present moment, when two parties are in conflict on the subject; and a declaration in favour of British colonization *under a new system*, by this body, of which Mr. Fowel Buxton is President, is the more satisfactory, as the contrary doctrine was propounded last year by a committee of the House of Commons, of which the same gentleman was chairman. The Society's sounder view of the matter is in accordance with a previous report of the same committee in 1836, which resolves that the old 'SYSTEM' of government as to the Aborigines required reform, and that its reform was not difficult. In the Second Report,

* E. G. Philip's Researches, 1828; and Bannister's Humane Policy, 1830.

† In the first battle, the emigrants lost more than forty people, and destroyed more than 400 natives. In the last they lost 270 people. The numbers of the natives killed is not reported: 300 white women and children have been killed, and the war is now carrying on with the utmost fury.

that of 1837, there was a mysterious abandonment of the right impression of 1836; an impression made by the examination of witnesses during two Sessions of Parliament, and justified by the evidence taken in the third session, as to the desirableness and facility of a reform of the bad system. The effect of this abandonment and reaction was, that the Colonial office, where that bad system is fostered, has hitherto escaped the radical correction without which all efforts to protect and improve the Aborigines in and near our colonies, will be vain. At the Anniversary, Sir Edward Cullen Smith, responded satisfactorily to the opinions thus expressed in the Report, and strongly maintained that as 'colonization wrongly conducted was a great 'curse, so rightly conducted it would confer great blessings on a 'country;' and there can be no doubt that to turn the curse to a blessing there is now wanted in our administration of what concerns independent coloured people the same 'new principles and new machinery,' which Mr. Clarkson has called for in an analogous case. 'It is idle,' says he most justly, 'to talk of protection, or redress of grievances in a slave colony, unless you 'act on *new principles*. There ought to have been a code of 'laws framed expressly in behalf of the Coolies before the order 'in council was sent out, so as to be ready to be acted upon as 'soon as they should have set foot in Guiana. There should 'also have been set up some *new machinery* for the more impartial distribution of Justice.'—(Letter from Thomas Clarkson to Lord Brougham, on the New British Slave Trade, May 20, 1838: Commentator, No. IX., p. 197.)

The new *system*, thus indispensable to the reform of colonization, would have been a natural result of the labours of the Commons' Committee appointed in 1835 to inquire into the state of the Aborigines in and near British settlements. The Society of which we speak considers that 'one principal reason that no important practical measure of a legislative character' has been proposed, is the absence of Mr. Buxton from Parliament; and its Report contains only a few recommendations on the subject, stating that, although a general measure is needed, 'the Society, 'aware of its magnitude and difficulty, only ventures to call to it 'the attention of the Government and legislature, without attempting to draw a Bill.'

Looking, however, to the names on the Society's Committee, comprising, as it does, six members of the House of Commons, and considering that scarcely a ship reaches England from the countries within the Society's range, without intelligence of some sanguinary events, it is deeply to be regretted, that a Bill has not been presented in the present Session by some of those able members. Dr. Lushington, Mr. C. Lushington, Mr. Baines, Mr. Hindley, and Mr. Pease, form a list not to be matched in any former parlia-

ment for enlightened freedom from legal, civil and religious prejudices, and at the same time, for the legal ability indispensable to the task. If all these gentlemen are too much occupied with other engagements to do justice to the subject in this form, it must not be forgotten that parliamentary* leaders will never be wanting if good matter be well prepared, and duly pressed out of doors. It may therefore be suggested with confidence to the Society, that the remainder of the present year cannot be more profitably employed by its Committee, than in preparing materials for resolutions, for public meetings, and for petitions to parliament and the queen, to serve as introductions to a new system, and particularly as the basis of a new law; and there is not the slightest ground of doubt, that the Society's *Journal*, or the *cheap publications* which its Report mentions, might in the six months to come before parliament meets again, be filled with matter from every region under the sun where British rule extends, to justify and explain, the kind of system for which men of all parties now call. Such petitions well supported, would probably bring the Society usefully and honourably through the Parliamentary Session of 1839.

The subject of a new code is intimately connected with '*the Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Aboriginal Tribes, re-printed with comments,*' by the Society; and it is not foreign to the formation of a new code to announce, that the Committee of the British and Foreign Aborigines Protection Society, have offered a prize of £50, given by one of their members, for the best Essay on the present state of the uncivilized and defenceless tribes; on the causes which have led to the diminution of their numbers, and to their debased condition; and on the best means of protecting them, and of promoting their advancement. A motto is to be attached to each Essay. A letter, enclosing the name of the Author, and indorsed with the motto, must also be forwarded, and will be returned unopened to the unsuccessful candidates. The Essays addressed to the Secretaries, No. 4, Bloomfield-street, must be delivered on or before the 31st of December, 1838.

Frequent occasions will offer themselves for the discussion of the various important topics which come within the range of this Society's labours; such for example, as *treaties* with Aboriginal tribes, colonization upon improved principles, and Colonial government in South Africa, as to all which, the Society has re-

* We happen to know that the subject of a general law in behalf of the Aborigines has been brought formally under the consideration of members of the House of Commons, unconnected with this Society.

corded in its 'comments' an entirely different opinion from that declared in the Report of the Parliamentary Committee of 1837.

These comments as far as they go, are made in an independent spirit; but while they charge 'abruptness of conclusion' upon the Parliamentary Committee, themselves also fall singularly short of the full merits of the case, as established by oral evidence, by late official papers, and by clear colonial history. The Society's Report goes beyond this fault of omission. For example, whilst all parties are agreed that the results of our existing *system* of colonization has been destructive to the Aborigines, and no man doubts but that the Home administration has long been guilty of persevering in that system against daily experience of its iniquity, the general inference from all the Society's documents taken together, as much as from the Report of the Parliamentary Committee, is that reform in the government itself is not needed. Both seem disposed to be satisfied with the Colonial office;—than which disposition, there could not perhaps be conceived one more fatal to the great objects involved in the question. A wiser spirit may be framed by a consideration of the truths declared in the following remarks from Mr. Howitt's able work on Colonization, which we hope shortly to introduce to our readers.

'We have now followed the Europeans to every region of the globe, and seen them planting colonies and peopling new lands, and every where we have found them the same—a lawless and domineering race, seizing on the earth as if they were the first-born of the creation, having a presumptive right to murder and dispossess all other people. For more than three centuries we have glanced back at them in their course, and every where they have had the Word of God in their mouth, and the deeds of darkness in their hand. Many are the evils that are done under the sun; but there is and can be no evil like that monstrous and earth-encompassing evil, which the Europeans have committed against the Aborigines of every country in which they have settled. And in what country have they not settled? It is often said as a very pretty speech, that the sun never sets on the dominions of our youthful queen; but who dares to tell us the more horrible truth, that it never sets on the scenes of our injustice and oppressions! For more than three centuries, and *down to the very last hour*, as this volume testifies, has this system, stupid as it is wicked, been going on. Thank God, the dawn of a new era appears at last!

* * * * *

'The cause of the Aborigines is the cause of three-fourths of the population of the globe. It is therefore with pleasure that I have seen *the Aborigines Protection Society* raise its head amongst the many noble Societies for the redress of the wrongs and the elevation of humanity, that adorn this country. Such a Society must become one of the most active and powerful agents of universal justice: *it must be that, or nothing*,—for the evil which it has to put down is tyrannous and strong beyond all others. It cannot fail without the deepest dis-

grace to the nation—for the honour of the nation, its Christian zeal, and its commercial interests, are all bound up with it. *Where* are we to look for a guarantee for the removal of the foulest stains on humanity and the Christian name? Our government may be well disposed to adopt juster measures; *but governments are not yet formed on those principles, and with those views, that will warrant us to depend upon them.*

Art. VIII. *Strike but Hear: a Correspondence between the Compiler of 'What? and who says it?' and the Editor of the Christian Observer.* With a Dedication to the Conductors of that Work. By JOHN SEARCH. 8vo. pp. 64. London: Ward and Co.

THE editor of the 'Christian Observer,' has lately been making a dead set at the 'Eclectic Review.' His right to do this is undoubted; the taste and temper displayed in it are, perhaps, questionable; its power to injure us is not very apparent. In the present article, it is not our intention to reply to the attack of our contemporary. We merely purpose showing, that he has committed one or two not unimportant mistakes; and that as to our silence, he and his friends the other 'conductors of the Christian Observer' are the last persons that ought to complain.

We have only at hand the July and August numbers of the 'Observer'—from the first, we learn that the editor attacked us in January, an extract from his article being given. In that extract in advancing to his denunciation of the 'Eclectic,' he selects three names from the list of more than thirty gentlemen who promised us literary contributions when we entered on our labours—these are, Dr. Smith, Dr. Vaughan, and Mr. Binney. Those gentleman are thus associated in the minds of his readers with what he is pleased to condemn. In the remarks, with which this extract of January is accompanied in July, Dr. Vaughan, Dr. Smith, and Mr. Binney again figure, and a readiness is expressed that if they will 'disclaim the doctrines which pass under their names as Eclectic co-operators, their disclaimer will be gladly inserted.' This offer was made, especially, to Dr. Vaughan, his name having occasioned the July paper, but was, of course, common to the others who with him had attained to the honour of 'the first three.' Our friend Dr. Smith writes, disapproving of what the 'Observer' had given, expressing his persuasion, however, that the context would no doubt be found greatly to modify it, and speaking of our work in a most handsome and honourable manner. Instantly after this, Dr. Vaughan and Mr. Binney, and all whom they are supposed to represent, are called

up and required to do likewise. Dr. Smith being approved as far as he goes, and the wish being expressed that 'all the other gentlemen whom the editor of the 'Eclectic' is authorized to announce as contributors to his pages, Dr. Vaughan and Mr. Binney among the number, would unite in the disclaimer.'

In giving the above statement, we have thrown out everything but the naked facts connected with our three friends, because, it is in relation to them, and not to the particulars of the attack made on the 'Eclectic,' that we intend at present to speak.

It really strikes us as very singular, that these three names should have been selected by the editor of the 'Christian Observer,' as we have shown they are. Dr. Vaughan has again and again been abused by him for his connexion with the 'Ecclesiastical Knowledge Society'—his sanctioning, by his secretaryship, all the virulence of its publications; Dr. Smith has been attacked not only by the 'Observer' but by Church publications generally, for his advocacy of ultra-dissenting principles, and his horrible crime of supporting Mr. Hume; as for Mr. Binney, every one knows that no image or epithet has been spared to depict or express his supposed rancour and savageness. 'The Weigh-house corrosive sublimate,' was the 'Christian Observer's' own figure. Other editors described him both as 'bellowing blasphemy,' and 'roaring after blood.' Hardly any three men have been so spoken against as these very three. Certainly, if we omit Dr. Vaughan, no two men are so thoroughly disliked and ill thought of by church people as Dr. Smith and Mr. Binney. If half that has been said of them in church publications, be true; if the one-tenth of what has been asserted of the latter be believed—why should they, either or any of them, the last one especially, be called upon to disclaim the intemperance of the 'Eclectic?' What earthly importance can the readers of the 'Observer' be supposed to attach to their patronage or disclaimer of any thing? Surely, it would have been more consistent to have selected other names from our list—the names of 'pious' not 'political' dissenters, and to have attributed at once, every thing in our work that could possibly be called by a bad word, to Dr. Smith, Dr. Vaughan, Mr. Binney—Mr. Binney, Dr. Vaughan, Dr. Smith.

This is not all—these gentlemen are spoken of in a way that we never spoke of them; they are *studiously* represented by the 'Observer' as if connected with the actual conducting of our work—as if they were members of a body, that met monthly at the printers, or publishers, or elsewhere—gave their advice and voice in this matter and in that—rejecting one article, approving another, and sharing the responsibility of every paper and of every page. Dr. Vaughan is spoken of as one 'responsible as a *director* of the 'Eclectic Review,' and asked to reconcile 'his *corporate* advice 'in his 'Eclectic' capacity with his personal.' He is asked,

whether he has 'disclaimed his *partnership* in the publication;' 'his share of responsibility for the offensive passages,' is another phrase. Expressions of similar import are to be found in various parts of the articles referred to and bearing on the other names.

Now, all this is adapted to convey a directly false and erroneous impression. We called upon or wrote to the gentlemen whose names we published, and obtained their promises of individual support, but they have, separately or combined, no connexion with the *management* of the work;—they are not a board of *directors*,—they are not a committee of *conductors*—they are not, therefore, to be held *responsible* in 'a corporate capacity' for every thing in it. The editor of the 'Observer' must know the difference between the official conductors of a work, and the 'contributors to its pages.' The late editor of the 'Eclectic,' in his parting address (January 1837), says, 'it will be gratifying to him 'still to be a *contributor* to the Review, though no longer engaged 'in its *management*.' The distinction is clearly drawn, and the difference in the two cases apparent. Let any person refer to our own address (February, 1837), and it will be seen that it is the address of an editor, not that of a number of associated 'conductors;' then let him turn to the address of the editor of the 'Observer,' in which, at the close of last year, he announced the commencement of a new series, and let him mark the difference:—*there* the very first words are '*the* CONDUCTORS of the 'Christian Observer' announce to THEIR friends,' and there is throughout the whole document the recognition of a number of persons united together in the actual and official management of the work—gentlemen who in every sense of the word *conduct* it—who determine what is to be inserted, and what not, and thus share the responsibility of all and every thing that appears in its pages, or is done by, or in the name of, their agent—the editor.

We have no wish to deprive ourselves of the sanction and support of the gentlemen whose names we published; nor to deny that we derive advantage from their appearing 'as contributors to our pages;' nor to assert that they have not a stake in the general character and conduct of our work. Our object is simply to state the real fact, in opposition to the studious and systematic insinuation by the 'Observer' of what is not the fact. Our friends are responsible each only for his own papers; they give no 'corporate advice,' and have no existence or 'responsibility as *directors*.' They even differ in some things among themselves and from us, though we agree in the greatest and most important principles. So long, as they approve, *on the whole*, our labours, and continue their contributions to our work, *we* shall feel sustained, and the public may feel confident. They have a right, however, to warn us if we do what they are compelled to question; if

charges were made against us involving our official integrity, they would be right in investigating their proofs; and, though they are not themselves the conductors of the work, and not, therefore, responsible for the acts of the editorial department, if that department was to be proved to be characterized by every thing mean, creeping, and crafty, they would be justified, from respect to themselves, in telling the public that they should cease to contribute to a work whose management was distinguished by what could not be sanctioned without dishonour.

While we thus admit that even the 'contributors' to a work, have an interest in the spirit and principles that preside over its management: we, of course, fully concur with what is so repeatedly obtruded in the language of the 'Observer,' that a 'corporate' body, by whose 'advice' that management is actually carried on, shares, in the fullest sense, responsibility with the editor. If he is honourable and honoured, they are exalted with him; if he is proved delinquent, they must share in his disgrace. Let us see, then, what John Search says, of and to, the editor and conductors of the 'Christian Observer.' The pamphlet before us consists, as its title announces, of a correspondence with the one, and a dedication to the other.

It is impossible for us to convey, in a brief article, any thing like an adequate idea of the humiliating condition, in which the editor of the 'Observer' appears in this pamphlet; he falls into it through a number of apparently little circumstances, which can only be understood by carefully reading the whole correspondence. Little things show the character. For a man to be able to do, what it is here shown the Observer did, he must have lost, by the habit of wrong-doing, the perception of its evil, and the sensibility which would have taught him *when* he approached it. Some men commit sin without the consciousness that it *is* sin; a circumstance that may palliate a particular offence, as there might be the absence just *then* of the intention to injure, but which fearfully illustrates the nature of the system in which they must have their habitual being. Things have come to a terrible pass if Christian men can have their faults excused, only on the ground taken by those '*accustomed to do evil*'—'*I meant no harm by it—I did not even know that I swore.*'

But this is anticipating. We proceed to say, that if our readers will turn to our number for November last, they will find a notice of John Search's previous pamphlet, 'What? and Who says it?' in which we give them to understand that there was much in it respecting the 'Christian Observer.' The fact is, that 'What? and Who says it?' contains many passages from the 'Observer,' and *proves* that it had grossly mutilated and garbled an extract which it gave from Mr. Binney, and flagrantly misrepresented both it and its author; that it had not only *surpassed*

his celebrated sentence by what it said of dissent, but had equalled it in its own attacks on the working of the establishment, claiming for Dr. Chalmers the great achievement of having 'clearly shown' 'that it was most ruinous to the souls of men.' These charges were sustained by quotations and extracts; by evidence which no sophistry could evade; and it was made manifest, also, that the time and circumstances of the things committed, greatly aggravated their inconsistency and injustice.

Will it be believed, that the information conveyed to the readers of our contemporary, of the character and contents of such a book, consisted of a *calumny*, reviling it as 'violent;' of a *falsehood*, affirming that it had done what it did *not*; of,—NOTHING, as to all it really *had* done to expose the dishonesty and inconsistency of the 'Observer?'

The thing is far worse than we have described: its tone of brotherhood aggravates the injury; the voice of Jacob attaches greater guilt to the hands of Esau. It is characterised, by qualities which we shrink from designating. Any one may judge of this for himself, by comparing the contents of 'What? and Who Says it?' with the notice of it by the 'Observer,' given, in full, in the first page of this 'correspondence.'

John Search writes and complains of this conduct; exposes the incorrectness of what the editor had said; and puts some questions to his *conscience* respecting his whole behaviour, which we should have been very sorry to have afforded ground for having put to ours. This was accompanied by the *whole* of what concerned him in 'What? and Who Says it?' with the request that he would put it before his readers, that they might fairly judge for themselves.

To this an answer is returned, in which all the way through, the editor shelters himself under the wing of his brethren 'the 'conductors of the Christian Observer:' in which he first speaks condescendingly to Mr. Search, as an anonymous writer, and then insults him by styling him a *pseudonymous* one; in which he insists on his ability to answer the book he had tried to strangle, confesses that 'it is clear,' he was wrong in what he said, professes his readiness to correct his own error if *Mr. Search will give him authority!* and ends by telling Mr. Search, that he writes 'only for his own eye;' and, in order to secure silence, he, by a characteristic trick, puts his own name into the postscript, to suggest, we suppose, to a writer he had injured and insulted, that he was not to dare to violate private confidence!

The bulk of the pamphlet consists of John Search's reply to this letter. There is not in it, from beginning to end, an angry or an ungentlemanly word, but its effect on the conscience of the editor of the 'Observer' (if he keeps a conscience,—he insinuates that neither Dr. Vaughan, Dr. Smith, nor Mr. Binney does) must have been

any thing but pleasing. Its exposure of him, its appeals to him, its constant reference to high moral considerations—the light in fact let in on the dark doings of editorial committee-rooms, and of the creeping things in the form of conductors of Christian publications, that weave their webs in these recesses of darkness—must have been positively excruciating. We would not have had such a document addressed to us either in our personal or ‘corporate capacity,’ for any amount of either praise or profit that periodical literature ever won.

Not only does ‘Strike, but Hear’ successfully appeal against being ‘*smitten* contrary to law by one who should judge according to law,’ but, as the Editor had expressed his belief that ‘What? and who says it?’ might be triumphantly replied to, at the same time showing, by his mode of speaking of it, that he did not accurately comprehend the nature and object of the argument it employs, *this matter* is also fully gone into, and the exact work which the Observer would have to do, clearly cut out for him, the argument of ‘What? and who says it?’ is explained—its authorities condensed, and the Editor of the Observer *dared* to the production of his ‘convincing reply.’

The Pamphlet in an Appendix gives the paper sent to the Observer with the first letter, and the book closes with a statement and declaration; for the latter of which we must find room, if we find none for anything else. We wish, however, to give, if possible, one or two other quotations from the work; and we *must* introduce a passage or two from the Dedication, with reflections upon which our notice must conclude. It is proper to say, that the Author again and again states his consciousness of the insignificance of the whole matter as it concerns himself, and that its importance is solely derived from the *principles* it involves. He makes his reflections bear on the critical, controversial, and periodical press in general, and we trust they will not be lost either on others or ourselves.

The following bears on the subject that gave rise to the correspondence :

‘I consider myself warranted strongly and seriously to remonstrate with you on your conduct in this matter. I am pained in doing it. I do not like to appear to take advantage of a brother in error; but I feel that something must be attempted to improve, if possible, the criticising and controversial *conscience* of the times. We are all deficient here;—but, I must say, that I regard my present, and my former proofs of *your* deficiency, to be peculiarly strong. Look calmly and fully at what you did. You began by a bold assumption about what you could not *know*, respecting what I *was*;—you went on to *assert*, what you are obliged to retract, respecting what I had *done*;—you represented yourself as perplexed to make out a meaning in my words, which, you now say, ‘*it is CLEAR*’ is not there;—you wrote in

a way to produce other false impressions, as I before showed;—the whole thing appears flippantly dashed off; and yet, you gloss over all with the terms and accent of brotherhood—represent yourself as the injured party—wonder how any one could father ‘the horrible images’ of his fancy on yours, or could suppose you to think of what, it turns out, nobody ever *did* think of *but* you!!—*and this is criticism and controversy!*—criticism and controversy, too, by *Christian Observers!*

* * * * *

‘The principle involved in your conduct towards me would sanction any controversial injustice whatever,—any criticism, however hasty or dishonest. But you ‘did not review the work,’ you say. True. But you *dispatched* it. At least, if it was not hung, it was pilloried, and that, too, for an *imputed* offence! Sir, you are a judge.—‘The conductors of the Christian Observer’ constitute a literary, and, in these days, a controversial, tribunal; their responsibilities, both to God and man, to the Redeemer and his church, are great; the functions they discharge demand care, conscientiousness, high moral principle, dignity, self-respect; and, if discharged otherwise, they may present, perhaps, to holy natures, a sight as painful and affecting, as, to a high-minded and just man, would be bribery or buffoonery on the bench. What would be thought, my brother, of a judge in a court of law, voluntarily summoning an individual before him, hastily charging him with a *false* accusation, condemning him, or even only sending him back into society with the character *he had created for him*, and then, when appealed to, and compelled to acknowledge his error, saying, ‘My dear Sir, ‘it is quite clear’ I was wrong, but you know—I *did not try you.*’ ‘Certainly, my Lord, and that’s the very thing I complain of; I was condemned untried, unexamined, unheard!’—pp. 16—19.

The following refers to a *fact* pointed out in ‘What? and who says it?’ but which, with all the rest in the book, the Editor calls ‘argument, opinion,’ &c.

‘Let me direct your attention to pages 11—13 of my former pamphlet. I place, side by side, a passage from Mr. Binney (*the passage, you know, which you have been perpetually parading and pelting with*), and a passage from yourself. I enter into no discussion; I have nothing to do with either the truth or falsehood—the right or wrong of your *opinions*; you may be *both* mistaken, for any thing I know, or care; that, with me, is not the point. My question is one of *fact*—*Does, or does not, the one writer misrepresent the other? Does he, or does he not, mutilate the passage he professes to quote with ‘the book before him,’ and change its character, and attribute to it a sense which it carefully excludes? Does he, or does he not, reason on this sense? Does he, or does he not, complain of the absence of qualifying phrases—the very things which are in the passage, but which he has left out?* These are not matters of ‘argument’ and ‘opinion’ and ‘discussion.’ I employed no discussion,—I want none. There are the two passages. Any number of plain men who have common sense, eyes, and honesty, whether they agree with either, or neither of the writers—whether

they have themselves a creed, or no creed—whether they be Christians, Jews, Turks, or Infidels—can judge of the question of *fact*—a question involving most serious charges against a book assuming a name indicative of ‘whatsoever things are *just, true, HONEST, and of good report* ;’ a book, which has just brought, *by its own acknowledgment*, an utterly unfounded charge against *me*,—me, ‘a pseudonymous writer!’—p. 21.

The following passage on the controversial character of the times merits deep attention :

‘The temptations that beset public Christian men in the present state of ecclesiastical controversy, and the present temper of the times, I know to be great. But they often spring from, and are always aggravated by, themselves. Some are precipitate ; many prejudiced ; very few patient of investigation, or superior to exclusive reading and sectarian associations. Some have no idea of any grand, spiritual consummation as their ‘ultimate aim,’ which, even if visionary, would sanctify their violence ; most depend for all information respecting their opponents on the pledged organs of their own party, instead of personally examining the books they blame ; and all, all, I fear, are chargeable with a low state of spirituality, which permits and prompts them to use the weapons of earth in the warfare of heaven—blinding them to the absurdity of thinking that they can serve God in the spirit of the devil, or conquer Satan through the power of Beelzebub. Christians of the present day, and especially controversial writers, and still more especially controversial editors, are all too much under the influence of what men of the world applaud as ‘spirit’—a wretched compound of selfishness, ignorance, vanity, and pride ; a thing without candour, patience, modesty, or courage ; which cares not how it commits injustice or inflicts pain,—and which will repeat a wrong rather than redress it, if the one course wins a cheer, and the other would involve an apology. We are all in fault here : ‘verily guilty’ in relation to this ‘abominable thing.’ Self, pride, party, are at once our idols and our tyrants ; and the love of them alike our crime and curse. We like our own errors better than The Truth, and our own sect better than The Church. We are indulgent and charitable to our party and ourselves, ungenerous and dishonest towards others. Breathing myself this infected atmosphere, and engaged in this blinding and perilous controversial occupation, I dare not affirm that, in relation to the ‘Observer,’ I have fallen into no error. I may have wronged and misrepresented you in my late work—in my former communication—in this letter ; but I do not *know* that I have. If I have, *I beg pardon of God and you.*’—pp. 41, 42.

The whole book concludes with the distinct specification of what John Search had proved against the Editor of the Observer in his first pamphlet. The offences are serious, and they were aggravated, as is shown, by circumstances. The following are the Author’s last words :

'Now the proofs of all this were lying under the eye of the editor of the *'Christian Observer'* exposed and remarked upon, in *'What?' and 'Who says it?'* when he penned the account of that pamphlet, which originated this correspondence. He knew that there were these things in the book; yet he wrote what conveyed the impression (whether intentionally or not God only and himself know) but what *did* convey, *that*, there was nothing in it to concern him, but *one single thing*, which he has acknowledged *'it is clear,'* from the work itself, is not in it at all!!

'The readers of this book will form their own judgment on these facts. For my part, I do not hesitate to say, that any man who *can*, by any possibility, *thus mistake, misrepresent, and commit himself, whether he do it from ignorance, design, carelessness, or haste*, is NOT POSSESSED EITHER OF THE INTELLECTUAL OR THE MORAL QUALITIES WHICH SHOULD PRESIDE OVER A WORK THAT ASPIRES TO THE CONFIDENCE OF THE *'CHRISTIAN'* PUBLIC; aspires to be the guide and expounder of opinions; to sit in judgment on the contents of books and the character of authors; and to discuss matters connected with the principles of ecclesiastical systems, the movements and the motives of conscientious, reflecting, and religious men.'—p. 64.

Though we have thus done with the Editor of the Observer, we have not finished with his friends. He constantly refers to 'the Conductors' of the work, flinging himself into their arms to avoid the danger that threatens himself. John Search therefore appeals to *them*. He dedicates his work to those who, on the Editor's principles as before referred to, are of course 'responsible' in their 'corporate capacity.' From this Dedication we take the following extracts:

'This, and my former publication, are intimately connected with a subject, on which you and other church writers, to use your own phrase, *'have so pertinaciously harped,'* that nothing has been heard about it, for four years, throughout the length and breadth of the land, but the piercing tones of your agonized instruments. You have filled the ears of your auditors with sounds of terror, indignation, and scorn; their minds with loathing, contempt, and hatred. You have done your best to make an individual *'infamous,'* and, through him, to attach infamy to his party and his principles. I have produced *facts* connected with *your* part in this affair, which bring into question your MORAL HONESTY as men; your *consistency* as writers—both as reasoners and as controversialists; your *competency* for the office you assume, or your *conduct* in discharging it; in short, the harmony of your character with the *name* you bear.

'These are not trifles. If my charges are false, they can be refuted; if my representations are wrong, they can be exposed; if your meaning is mistaken, it can be explained; if you can answer my argument, you can answer it. I have a right, however, to demand, that before you attempt this you will take the trouble to understand it. Read what I have written; and *so* read it, as not to attach to me what you may have to acknowledge *'it is clear'* I never meant. You are men,

doubtless, of education and ability ; your minds have been disciplined by University exercises ; you have studied mathematics and practised logic ; you are acquainted with the nature of the *argumentum ad hominem*, and know that while it proves nothing it can silence noise. Carefully and scrupulously mark, then, the precise object of my former pamphlet, and the simple aim of my citations and references ; weigh what I have produced as *proof* of your dishonesty and inconsistency ; look at what you *did*—listen to what you uttered, and,—if you can, answer *me*, and defend yourselves.

*

*

*

*

‘Gentlemen, in the last letter addressed to your editor, you will find a passage beginning with—‘I do not wonder at your fears,’ and ending with **FOUR** WORDS, which I will not repeat. Are these words strong ? they are. Are they ungentlemanly, or unchristian ? Let us distinguish :—no other words would clearly convey the ‘impression’ of what you *did* (I identify you with the acts of your official representative) ; if it be ungentlemanly or unchristian to call bad things by their right names, *what must it be to do them ?* I wrote those four words calmly and seriously ; I selected them as the most appropriate ; I transcribed them ; I sent them ; they have reached your hand and met your eye ;—the charge they contain against you, I here distinctly and deliberately repeat. My view of your conduct may be erroneous ; but what it *is*, I have said. If you have any reverence for public opinion ; if you have any self-respect ; if you have any value for character, which you say is ‘your all,’ you will be ill at ease under such imputations, ‘even from an anonymous or *pseudonymous* writer.’ Purchase, then, the privilege of clearing your character by defence, or of retrieving it by contrition, by making an attempt to answer the charges which *I* have preferred. When you have done this, then, with calmness and dignity, without either ‘flippant’ airs, or noisy asseverations, demand the production of the document from which I gathered the ‘impression’ I described, and—*you shall be obeyed*. I am authorised to state, that it shall be given to the public *under the signature of the gentleman in whose possession it is*.

‘In conclusion, gentlemen, permit me to say, that I am influenced in my present course by a deep and solemn conviction, that a hasty, prejudiced, periodical press is one of the crying calamities of the times. Supported by either Churchman or Dissenter, such an instrument is one of almost unmingled mischief—one most disastrously successful in fomenting and perpetuating our religious animosities. It misrepresents good men to each other ; it misjudges their motives and character ; it comes in between them with its notices of what has been written, or its records and reports of what has been done, and by perverting both, keeps each side from examining the works, and from seeking to understand the wishes of the other.’—pp. iv—vii.

The former part of this last extract is both strange and striking ; there is a reference to some communication which had been sent to the Editor, but which we cannot find in the pamphlet, and a mysterious allusion to some passage in it containing **FOUR**

WORDS—the bad names of bad things with which ‘the conductors of the Christian Observer’ seem to have been charged in consequence of the acts of their ‘official representative;’ they are dared to meet the charges brought against themselves by John Search; to call for the evidence of the opinion he had expressed; and they are not only to be obeyed, but obeyed in a manner which anonymous writers are not entitled to demand, and pseudonymous ones have no right to expect.

We now close this imperfect review of what so affects the character and credit of our once respectable and respected contemporary, by a single remark bearing on the business with which we began. Four months we think have now passed away, since the Christian Observer, with its editor and conductors, were brought to the bar of public opinion by ‘Strike but Hear,’—there they have stood silent as death; yet, while dumb under charges that directly touch their ‘moral honesty as men,’ *they have been reiterating demands on certain of the contributors to the ‘Eclectic,’ by name*, to disclaim that which they never wrote, perhaps never read. Can they expect to be listened to? Have they a right to be regarded? Is their conduct *decent* even? Who are the conductors of the Observer? We furnished the names of some of our friends who promised to become ‘contributors to our pages,’ whom the editor of the Observer wishes to make ‘responsible as directors.’ Will *he* publish the names of those who *are* the ‘responsible conductors’ of his work? After the disclosures of John Search, is there any man, or any number of men, prepared to come forward to avow their share of official responsibility in the conducting of the Observer, or to defend its editor against the charges under which he lies? Will he himself tell us the ‘*four words*?’ Will he give us the passage which it would seem they closed, and tell us his reason for not doing that which might entitle him to demand the document referred to? It’s a bad business, we fear, from beginning to end, and both the editor and the conductors (if there are any) of the Christian Observer *know* it to be bad. The ‘contributors to our pages’ who have read the two pamphlets by John Search, may well be excused for declining to listen to the call of convicted and silenced delinquents.

Lest it should be insinuated by the editor of the Observer, that we have confined ourselves to that view of his conduct which affects our friends, Dr. Smith, Dr. Vaughan, and Mr. Binney, whom he has so frequently and improperly dragged into his pages, because we durst not face his charge as it affects ourselves, we think it proper to add, that we sought for the offensive article, and feel quite ready to reason with him

respecting it. After beginning with our December number, and going backwards, having no clue supplied by his two papers referred to in the preceding article, we at last found that the obnoxious piece was published by us in April, 1837. We endeavoured to read it with impartiality, and we do most conscientiously say, that while there may be some expressions in it, which in the exercise of our editorial discretion it might have been better for us to have softened, yet it cannot, we think, by any candid and unprejudiced mind, be admitted to sustain the interpretation, or seem justly to warrant the strictures of our contemporary. The very first sentence states, "that a crisis has arrived respecting the question of Church Rates, when the Church of England may not only *save herself with honor, but secure a moral influence in the hearts of the people, which will place her above the power of her enemies, and RENDER HER A LASTING BLESSING TO THE NATION.*" This does not look very intemperate. The fact is, that, like all other discussions by Dissenters of a similar kind, in order to be rightly understood, and justly judged, it requires the distinction to be kept in view, between the Church and *the Establishment*. Thus, in the very paragraphs from which the Observer selects the phrases which he condemns, after referring to the *political alliance* of the Church with the State, it is said, 'The dissenters do not deny that in a church thus constituted, the doctrines of the gospel may be embodied in symbols and formularies, and that *multitudes may exist within its pale that are sincere Christians and members of the universal church*, but they cannot regard it as an institution having entirely or chiefly in view the advancement of pure and spiritual religion.' It is also said, 'it is true that, by the compulsory exactions of the established churches of the realm dissenters are required to contribute to the support of Christianity; but are they not also required to contribute to support *something else which is NOT Christianity*, and which they believe to be not only foreign to its nature, but directly opposed to its genius and spirit.' Now it is to this "*something else*" that the phrases so offensive to the Observer are to be referred: namely, to the interference of worldly men with sacred things; to official patronage; to the power over spiritual appointments of the ministers of the day; to that part of the system, in fact, with its working, which the pious of the land, both churchmen and dissenters, equally deplore, and which cannot be better described than in the words of the Observer himself, as quoted by John Search in both his pamphlets. His language is positive and strong. He *asserts*, that 'it is *not even pretended, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred*, that either a private or official patron seriously sets himself to look out for the person best qualified for an appointment.' He describes

Mr. Simeon as accused of the crime of spending large sums in the purchase of advowsons for the sole object, as our reviewer would express it, of the 'advancement of pure and spiritual religion;' 'but,' adds the Observer, '*no one pretends that such crimes are common. The auctioneers who daily knock down advowsons to the best bidder, never suspect that they are bought upon such Utopian principles. It is enough, the purchaser has somebody to provide for. So also in the case of public and official patrons.*' Our reviewer certainly uses strong language in speaking of the tendency of a system, of which this is a part, to deteriorate the character of Christianity, and injure its influence; but what does the Observer himself say? '*We have not a shadow of doubt that it is most mischievous to the cause of true piety. Dr. Chalmers has clearly shown that it has been most ruinous to the souls of men.*' If in his notion of what is 'not Christianity,' and which dissenters are not compelled to uphold, by paying to the establishment, our reviewer included those popish and dangerous dogmas, which are enforced by so many of its ministers, and which the British Critic asserts, in its last number, not only do not infringe 'one doctrine of the articles or prayer-book,' but are so pre-eminently 'church doctrines,' that as to adopting and advocating them, 'in the case of the clergy, this effect *must* follow, if they are honest, or a necessity of retiring from their existing engagements;' (the italics, in this last passage, are the British Critic's)—if, we say, our reviewer referred to these, in connexion with the political part and working of the establishment, as tending to make it 'as subversive of the influence of Christianity as any form of 'paganism,' &c., what does the Observer himself say on this matter, as quoted by Mr. Search? 'On this,' says he, 'our language has been, and will be, strong; the discussion relates to questions which involve *the whole economy of the gospel, of protestantism, of a standing or falling church, of the salvation of the souls of men, we believe the system to be anti-evangelical, anti-protestant, and a snare of our ghostly enemy to impede the progress of the pure gospel of Christ, and endanger the souls of men.*'

But, supposing our reviewer to have used the most dreadful language imaginable against the tendency of political establishments as such, let us see if the Observer cannot match him in his description of the tendency of dissent as such. Again we are indebted to John Search. 'We believe dissent,' says the Observer, 'to be *an evil greater than we can express, and if carried to the extent of the subversion of the national churches of England and Scotland, to say nothing of other protestant countries, nothing but a direct special miracle, which we have no right to look for, more especially when we have set aside the*

‘*obvious means of grace, could prevent the ultimate extirpation of Christianity from the earth!!*’ The Observer is very indignant at Dr. Chalmers being accused of blasphemy. We neither admire the individual who made that charge against him, nor maintain its propriety; but we would shrink ourselves from such language as the above, lest we should tread on the precincts of the sin. The idea, that if the political support of Christianity were to cease *in England and Scotland only*, the episcopal and presbyterian churches still remaining, all the sects also remaining, all things also remaining as they are in the other protestant countries of Europe, and in America; the idea, that if this *one thing* were to take place in this island, God’s own truth, the gospel of his Son, the universal church with all her ministers, and ordinances, and multitudes, would vanish away, die, and determine, not only in Britain, but throughout all the world, is perfectly appalling. Without ‘a direct special miracle,’ however, this would occur it is thought, because, we suppose, in the truth of Christ, in the *ordinary* influences of the Divine Spirit, in the attachment of believers and ministers to the faith which they respectively profess and preach, in the power of prayer, or any other thing connected with the creed or character of the pious, the zeal of earth, and the promised co-operating might and mastery of heaven;—because, in all these there is *no security* for the *preservation* even, not to say the diffusion, of Christianity in the world, *without the political establishment of it* IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND!!! The man who can deliberately write this as his ‘belief,’ and who can say also what he does, about the ‘most ruinous’ effect to the souls of men of the working of certain parts of *his own church*, ought neither to charge dissenters with making ‘presumptuous party estimates,’ nor to find fault with the occasional strong language, in relation to the establishment, of some of the contributors to the pages of the ‘Eclectic Review.’ Is it for this writer to charge Dr. Vaughan, Dr. Smith, and Mr. Binney, with ‘not keeping a conscience?’ Is it for him to describe them as determined to support *their party*, despite of either decency or truth? We will take our leave of him with a recommendation and a report. Our recommendation is, that he prepare his ‘*very* convincing reply’ to ‘What and who says it?’ as speedily as possible, and prepare it, looking fairly at the *real question* he has to meet, and controlling, like his antagonist, both his temper and his pen; and that, till he has done this, he cease his attacks on us and our contributors. Our report, perhaps *fact*, is, that a gentleman, in conversing some little time since with the editor of a church periodical is understood to have said, ‘Now you know, Mr. —, that the dissenters are not the men you re-

‘present, nor are they aiming at the ends you ascribe to them.’ ‘Oh! as to that,’ was the reply, ‘I am not up to my party yet.’ Thanks to that grace to which we are so much indebted, Dr. Smith, Dr. Vaughan, and Mr. Binney, support no such partizanship as this in countenancing and contributing to *our pages*.

Art. IX. *Life and Administration of Edward, first Earl of Clarendon; with Original Correspondence and Authentic Papers never before published.* By T. H. LISTER, Esq. 3 vols. London: Longman & Co. 1838.

FEW statesmen occupy a larger space in English history than Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon. The part he acted in the early deliberations of the Long Parliament; his subsequent desertion of the popular leaders, and faithful adherence to the king; the zeal with which he labored to outmatch Hampden, Pym, and Vane, in the paper war which was carried on between Charles and the Parliament; the influence he exercised, over—with few exceptions—the contemptible and worthless clique which formed the court of the exiled prince; the part he took in the restoration; his unscrupulous rigor towards the Presbyterians, and the despotic character he imprinted on the restored dynasty; his treachery to English liberty, and the base ingratitude of his worthless master; have all conspired to invest his biography with the deepest interest,—to enrich it with a moral which statesmen and courtiers may profitably study. His life was amongst the most eventful of a period crowded beyond all parallel with the elements of deep tragedy; and whether viewed in its brighter or darker periods, in its seasons of prosperity or of bitter reverse, holds out an instructive lesson to the men of succeeding times. It is matter of surprise that the biography of Clarendon has not been worthily executed ere this. His position and services entitled him to early notice from his party, while the relation his biography sustains to the general history of his country claims for it an extended and detailed notice. We possess three *Memoirs of Clarendon*,—one written by himself; another included in a work published in 1708, and entitled, ‘*The Lives of the Chancellors*,’ and a third by Macdiarmid, in his ‘*Lives of British Statesmen*.’ Of these it is sufficient to remark, that the first is distinguished in an extraordinary degree by inaccuracies and omissions, and is moreover subjected to a partial coloring, natural in the circumstances of the writer, but destructive of historical fidelity; the second is a meagre compilation swelled out by long speeches, taken from historical

writings generally accessible; and the third is entitled to no credit, either for research or accuracy. The field was therefore unoccupied, and we are glad that a worthy laborer has attempted its cultivation. Of Mr. Lister's former publications, we are entirely ignorant. We know him only as the author of the volumes before us; and it is therefore with more than ordinary pleasure, that we commence our notice of his work by recording our favorable judgment. He has executed a task of no little difficulty in a manner highly to his own honor. Extensive research, and no inconsiderable degree of impartiality, are happily united in his case with a sound understanding, views generally correct, and a pleasing, if not terse and vigorous style. We frequently dissent from his judgments; but in doing so, we invariably honor his candor, integrity, and fair dealing. But we are anticipating ourselves. The appearance of his volumes affords us an opportunity, of which we gladly avail ourselves, to canvass the leading events in the public life of Clarendon: and the remarks we shall offer will sufficiently exhibit some of the points on which we differ from our author.

Edward Hyde was born on the 18th of February, 1609, at Dinton, in the county of Wilts. The circumstances of his parents were easy, without being affluent. His father was a member of several parliaments during the reign of Elizabeth, but spent the last thirty years of his life in the retirement of the country; where, the son says, his parents 'enjoyed and improved their estates, and kept good hospitality in their houses, brought up their children well, and were beloved by their neighbours.' The youthful statesman received his early classical education from the clergyman of his father's parish, and his progress was so considerable that in his fourteenth year he was sent to Oxford, where he entered at Magdalen Hall in 1622. His first destination was for the church, but this was subsequently changed for the law,—probably through the influence of his uncle, Sir Nicholas Hyde, afterwards Chief Justice of the King's Bench. During the early part of his residence in London, his health was seriously impaired, and the consequent interruption of his legal studies, induced habits of idleness, which seriously threatened his professional success. His companions, moreover, were, as Mr. Lister remarks, 'of a kind ill calculated to promote the diligence of a law student.' They were chiefly military men, whose habits were idle and dissipated, and whose influence was fraught with great peril to their youthful associate. He himself, in after life, was not insensible of the risk he had incurred, remarking, 'he had more cause to be terrified upon the reflection, than the man who had viewed Rochester Bridge in the morning that it was broken, and which he had galloped over in the night.' Happily for himself, young Hyde escaped the contaminations of the Society in which he moved, and his marriage, in 1629, to a daughter of Sir George

Ayliffe, of Gretenham, in the county of Wilts, served to arouse his faculties, and to induce a vigorous application to the studies proper to his profession. This connexion, though speedily terminated by the death of his wife, had an important influence on the fortunes of Hyde. It introduced him to the acquaintance of the ill-fated Duke of Hamilton, and paved the way for his subsequent promotion. A second marriage, contracted in 1632, and the death of his father, which occurred in the same year, further served to determine the bent of his mind. His time was divided between his profession, and such literary studies as were most congenial to his tastes, and best suited to improve the high powers with which he was endowed. His associates were chosen from the most eminent men of his day. He mingled but little with the members of his own profession, but spent much of his time with Ben Jonson, Selden, May, Waller, Hales, Chillingworth, and other distinguished literary men. The influence of these early companionships is clearly traceable in the productions of his riper age; and to them we are probably mainly indebted for the writings, which have secured him an imperishable name among English authors.

The state of public affairs at this period is well known to our readers. The crown was worn by a prince incapable of reading the signs of the times. A momentous revolution had for some years been going on in the sentiments and habits of the English people. Long before Charles the First ascended the throne, the precursors of change,—the intimations of coming strife were visible. The reformation had broken up the monotony of society, and divided the people into classes, whose activity and zeal were proportioned to the immense importance of the interests at stake. Intellect had become a recognized element of society, and its sportiveness and power on its escape from the enthrallment of ages, portended its subsequent achievements. The nature of government had come to be better understood, the worth of popular liberty was felt, men of all classes sighed for the hour of redemption, and began to declaim in free and ominous speech, on the limits of prerogative, and their own inalienable claim to freedom. The current had gathered strength during the feeble and debased reign of James, who left a heritage of folly to his son, which served to hasten his fate, and bring on the crisis of the struggle. Charles ascended the throne in the twenty-fifth year of his age, and soon made it evident that he was of all men least fitted to master the difficulties of his position. His confidence was given to Buckingham, a man of mean talents, of imperious carriage, and of repulsive selfishness. The rashness and pride of the minister, was only equalled by the absurd favouritism, and weak compliances of the king. While a storm was gathering which speedily convulsed the empire and overturned the throne, Charles

was intent only on gratifying the whims, and following out the policy, of his unprincipled adviser. The fearful struggle, which was to terminate in his arraignment and execution, commenced from the first hour of his reign. Three parliaments were successively convened, in the delusive hope of rendering the forms of the constitution subservient to the despotic policy of the king; but the guardians of English liberty refused to betray their trust, and the houses were consequently dissolved in contemptuous displeasure. The young monarch thought to play the tyrant with as high a hand as the last Henry; but the times were changed, and he fell before the wrath of an insulted and indignant nation. The last of these dissolutions took place in 1629, the year of Clarendon's first marriage: and a royal proclamation was shortly afterwards issued, declaring that it would be esteemed presumption, and be punished as such, for any to invoke the name of parliament, or to call upon the king to summon together the representatives of his people. Sir John Eliot,—one of the noblest of English patriots,—fell a sacrifice to the vengeance of the court: and a thousand means were devised by supple lawyers and unprincipled divines, to break down the spirit of the English people. Mercy was banished equally from the court and the church. The apostate Strafford ruled the one, and the mean-spirited and superstitious Laud the other. The capacious intellect of the former, found a ready instrument in the hard-heartedness and lust of power, which characterized the latter. It was a terrible struggle between tyranny and freedom,—the obsolete pretensions of a former age, and the equitable claims of a regenerated intellect. The scale trembled in the balance, and the most sagacious observer might well doubt the result.

It was at such a period,—so critical and momentous,—that Hyde was ushered into public life. We know but little of his early political prepossessions, but that little disposes us to infer that they were favorable to the court. On the publication of Prynne's *Histrio-mastix*, one sentence of which Laud and his chaplain Heylin so infamously misrepresented to the king and queen, Hyde took a prominent part in a masque performed by the four principal Inns of Court, 'as an expression of their love and duty to their majesties,' and, to use the words of Whitelocke, 'because this action would manifest the difference of their opinion from Mr. Prynne's new learning, and serve to confute' his work. On this occasion,—strange to say,—he was associated with Whitelocke and Selden, as well as with Noy, Herbert, and Finch. The expense of the pageant is said to have exceeded twenty-one thousand pounds. He was shortly afterwards introduced to Laud, when the latter was seeking, with the animosity natural to a mean and ungenerous spirit, 'discovery of past actions which might reflect upon the memory' of the Earl

of Portland, Lord of the Treasury, then recently deceased. Hyde had been employed by the merchants of London to draw up a petition against an order of the late treasurer, which being reported to Laud, he desired to see him. The young lawyer waited on the primate, and the flattering style of his reception, made a favorable impression, which strongly influenced his subsequent sketches of Laud. In the meantime, the government was conducted as a pure despotism.

‘Never,’ says Mr. Lister, ‘had the people of England, in so advanced a state of civilization, been subject to an oppression so general, so odious, so little redeemed by aught that could either flatter the nation, or even conciliate a particular class. No one powerful party was engaged to lend its aid for the subjugation of the rest. . . . Neither the aristocracy, the gentry, the merchants, nor the yeomen, were interested, as a class, in supporting the prerogative. The majority of each, if not inimical, were at least indifferent. The clergy alone, led on by Laud, appeared, as a body, to sympathise with the crown. But the church, while it sought strength from royalty, afforded none. It only swelled, by its pretensions, the number of malcontents, and aggravated their stubbornness by the addition of sectarian zeal. It gave a religious character to the contest. It afforded to the disaffection of the nonconformist a higher motive than pecuniary grievance. The bench was submissive; and an assumption of legal forms was, for a while, the most effectual device by which that reverence for law and order, which characterises the English people, was made an instrument for their subjugation.

‘Under such auspices, and with such appliances, was pursued a system of comprehensive and manifold oppression, menacing all persons, sapping all rights, annulling immunities deemed indefeasible, breaking promises deemed inviolable—a tyranny of spies and tax-gatherers, carrying its vexations into every household, and poisoning the daily comforts of the people, thwarting their occupations, despoiling their property, meddling with their trade; yet, because this tyranny was not sanguinary—because it fined, maimed, imprisoned, but did not kill—we are told to wonder that the people should rebel.’—pp. 46, 47.

At length, the king was reduced to the necessity of again summoning a parliament. It met on the 13th of April, 1640, and was briefly assured by Charles, ‘that there never was a king ‘that had a greater and more weighty cause to call his people ‘together’ than himself. Hyde was a member of this parliament, and occupied a somewhat equivocal position in its debates, being opposed to Hampden on a question, which the popular party deemed of vital importance. A struggle commenced from its first meeting, the one party asking for supplies, the other demanding additional safeguards for liberty. Pym and Hampden had waited their hour, and now that it was arrived, they determined on gathering its fruits. Precedence was given

to the question of grievances, which were divided into three classes, innovations in religion, invasions of property, and violations of parliamentary privileges. Message after message was received from the king, urging the necessity of an immediate supply of his pecuniary wants; but the popular leaders knew their position too well to accede to his prayer. The lords were induced to enforce it, but their interposition was voted a breach of privilege, and the commons proceeded, temperately but firmly, to discharge their high trust. Perceiving, at length, that money would be voted only on conditions favourable to popular liberty, the short-sighted monarch, on the 5th of May, summoned the commons to the upper house, and then dissolved the parliament. 'There could not,' says Clarendon, 'a greater damp have seized upon the spirits of the whole nation, than this dissolution caused; and men had much of the misery in view which shortly after fell out. It could never be hoped that more sober and dispassionate men would ever meet together in that place, or fewer who brought ill purposes with them; nor could any man imagine what offence they had given which put the king to that resolution.'

During the summer of this year, Charles attempted to prop his tottering tyranny. He still clung to the hope of ruling without parliaments, and having marshalled an army, he proceeded towards the north to chastise the Scotch presbyterians. It is needless to say his efforts were unavailing. The troops abhorred the war in which they were engaged; and the necessity of the case, at length compelled the king, once more to summon the representatives of his people to meet him at Westminster. They obeyed his summons on the 3rd of November, and their policy was no longer equivocal or hesitating. The long parliament was the theatre on which Hyde properly began his political life. Its members were returned under a ferment similar to that recently witnessed, when William the Fourth atoned for the political blunders of his father and brother, by calling on his people to pronounce judgment on the question of 'Reform.' The feeling of the nation was united and strong, and generated a momentary patriotism in the hearts of phlegmatic and calculating politicians. Hyde was returned for Saltash, and took an early and prominent part in the deliberations of this celebrated assembly. At first, he went along with the popular leaders in denouncing the misgovernment of the king, and in bringing his advisers to punishment. No man save Pym and Hampden was more active than Hyde, and few spoke in stronger terms of reprobation. Those of our readers who are acquainted with the delusive account furnished in the 'History of the Rebellion,' of the state of the kingdom during the previous twelve years, will be surprised at the following language uttered by Hyde, at a conference of both houses on the 6th of July, when

he brought forward the charges of the commons against the barons of the exchequer.

‘There cannot be a greater instance of a sick and languishing commonwealth than the business of this day. Good God! how have the guilty these late years been punished, when the judges themselves have been such delinquents! ’Tis no marvel, that an irregular, extravagant, arbitrary power, like a torrent, hath broken in upon us, when our banks and our bulwarks, the laws, were in the custody of such persons. Men who had lost their innocence, could not preserve their courage; nor could we look that they who had so visibly undone us, themselves should have the virtue or credit to rescue us from the oppression of other men. It was said by one who always spoke excellently, that the twelve judges were like the twelve lions under the throne of Solomon,—under the throne—in obedience,—but yet lions. Your Lordships shall this day hear of six, who (be they what they will be else) were no lions; who upon vulgar fears delivered up the precious forts they were trusted with, almost without assault; and in a tame and easy trance of flattery and servitude, lost and forfeited (shamefully forfeited) that reputation, awe, and reverence, which the wisdom, courage, and gravity of their venerable predecessors had contracted and fastened to the places they now hold; and even rendered that study and profession, which in all ages hath been, and I hope now shall be, of an honourable estimation so contemptible and vile, that, had not this blessed day come, all men would have had this quarrel to the law itself, which Marius had to the Greek tongue, who thought it a mockery to learn that language, the masters whereof lived in bondage under others.’—pp. 80, 81.

There is ample evidence of the part which Hyde took against Strafford. He served on different committees; and, as if to reward his zeal, was on the 25th of March added to a committee for expediting the trial of this capital delinquent. We have no record of the vote he gave on the bill of attainder, but the presumption is great that he supported it.

‘His name is not found in the list of ‘Straffordians.’ It is improbable that one who was hostile to the attainder, should have been selected as the bearer of such a message, as he carried up to the lords on the 28th of April. Falkland spoke, and, it may therefore be presumed, voted, for the bill of attainder; and Hyde tells us, that his subsequent vote on the bill against episcopacy was the first in which he and Falkland had ever differed.’—pp. 94, 95.

Thus far Hyde’s political career had identified him with the popular cause. It had been consistent and straightforward, free apparently from every selfish ingredient, and aiming only at the true interests of his country.

In the summer of 1641, however, he began to waver. The question of episcopacy was then under debate, and Hyde signalised himself as its champion. As chairman of a committee, he resorted to the meanest artifices in order to arrest the progress of the bill for its extinction. His own pen has recorded his dishonorable chicanery; but Mr. Lister prefers questioning the accuracy of his report, to an admission of facts so disgraceful to his hero. There is something amusing in the facility with which our author resorts on this, and similar occasions, to any hypothesis by which to evade conclusions unfavorable to Hyde's character. We entertain no such views of the theoretical completeness of that character, and are, therefore, more disposed to regard his conduct 'as an instructive example of the character of a lawyer full 'charged with all the pitiful tricks of his profession.' 'I do not 'love Clarendon,' says Mr. Godwin, 'but I could almost find in 'my heart to compassionate the despicable figure he makes.' These are strong words, but they are not wholly undeserved.

His zeal on behalf of the bishops, recommended Hyde to the notice of Charles, who was now about to visit Scotland, in the hope of ingratiating himself with his northern subjects. The king sent him a message by the brother of the Earl of Northumberland, requesting to speak with him, and the interview which took place in consequence, was private and long. We have no other account of it than that which Hyde furnishes in his *Life*, written twenty-eight years after its occurrence; and as it exercised an important influence over his future fortunes, we shall give it in his own words.

'The king told Hyde, 'that he had heard from all hands how much he was beholden to him, and that when all his servants in the House of Commons either neglected his service, or could not appear usefully in it, he took all occasion to do him service; for which he thought fit to give him his own thanks, and to assure him that he would remember it to his advantage.' He took notice of his affection to the church, for which, he said, he thanked him more than for all the rest, which the other acknowledged with the duty that became him, and said, he was very happy that his majesty was pleased with what he did; but if he had commanded him to have withdrawn his affection and reverence for the church, he would not have obeyed him, which his majesty said, made him love him the better. Then he discoursed of the passion of the house, and of the bill then brought in against episcopacy; and asked him, whether he thought they would be able to carry it? To which he answered, he believed they could not; at least, that it would be very long first. 'Nay (replied the king), if you will look to it that they do not carry it before I go for Scotland, which will be at such a time when the armies shall be disbanded, I will undertake for the church after that time.' Why then (said the other), by the grace of

God, it will not be in much danger.' With which the king was well pleased; and dismissed him with very gracious expressions.'—pp. 114, 115.

From this hour Hyde is to be regarded as a deserter from the popular camp. In his autobiography, written many years afterwards, with an indistinct recollection of facts, and under the influence of strong party feeling, he represents himself as having been suspected of a leaning to the court from the first meeting of the long parliament. The statement is not improbable, nor would its truth impeach, either the sagacity, or fair dealing, of his illustrious contemporaries. The bias of his mind was probably visible from the first. The protégé of Laud, who according to his own account 'well knew how to cultivate the advantages' of having such a patron, was not likely to enter St. Stephen's devoted body, soul, and strength to the cause of the people. Carried along for a season by the impetuosity of a torrent which swept all before it, he soon regained his natural position, disengaged himself from the temporary associations into which he had been hurried, and pledged his talents and zeal to the services of royalty and the court. Like most of his profession, his prepossessions were in favor of the king. Mindful of the letter, but neglectful of the spirit of the English constitution, he was disqualified for taking part in that revision of the balance of powers, which was necessitated, by the enlargement of the national intellect, and the clearer perception of individual rights, which marked his age. At an earlier era he might have been an enlightened and safe adviser of the crown; but 1641 his notions were antiquated, and his counsels detrimental to his employers.

The position of public affairs afforded an apology, not wholly without force, for Hyde's secession from the popular cause. When parliament met on the 3rd of November, the king was surrounded by Strafford and Laud, and the meaner instruments of his tyranny. The Star Chamber and the High Commission Court were in full operation; the seats of justice were defiled by the presence of unprincipled judges; and the undefined powers of prerogative threatened to subvert the ancient safeguards of English liberty. The king was known to be alike despotic and faithless, alienated in heart from the best features of the English constitution, and intent only on giving consistency and permanence to the worst precedents of a former age. Every eye was therefore directed to the throne as the exclusive source of danger, and the hope of the nation was fixed on the sagacity and firmness of its representatives. But the position of parties had undergone a mighty change in the short interval which had elapsed. Strafford had suffered the due penalty of his crimes; Laud was a despised prisoner in the Tower; the guilty judges were in exile;

the arbitrary courts, where tyranny had sported in its lawlessness, were abolished, never to be revived; and the present parliament was insured against dissolution without its own consent.

Upon the change thus effected in the relative strength of parties, the defence of Hyde is rested by his advocates. The king, it is alleged, was powerless, the commons were triumphant; the former, however disposed, was now incapable of playing the tyrant; the latter were violently bent on arrogating to themselves all the powers of the state. The very principles, therefore, it is argued, which would have led a patriot to attach himself to the popular party at the first meeting of parliament, enforced an adhesion to the monarchical branch of the constitution. From having been the assailant, the king was become the rallying point, of freedom. These considerations are urged by Mr. Lister, and the soundness of the defence will be admitted or denied, according to the view which is entertained of the general dispute. One thing deserves consideration, as bearing conclusively on the validity of this reasoning in reference to Hyde. With the exception of ecclesiastical measures, no material difference had hitherto been evinced between him and the men, to whom he was henceforth so bitterly opposed. He had supported all the chief measures of the session, not excepting even the bill for perpetuating the parliament; and was not therefore in a position to plead the unconstitutional and dangerous tendency of the proceedings of the popular party. He had uttered no protest against their doings, save in the case of prelacy; but had been among the most active in forwarding several of their bills. In his subsequent vindication, when attempting to impugn the policy of his opponents, and to justify himself, his principal stress is laid upon the remarks of individuals—remarks made in the freedom of social intercourse, and without any pretensions to be regarded, as expository of the policy of the great leaders of the parliament. Had Hyde's secession taken place a year later, and had the conduct of parliament in the interim been exactly what history now records,—a supposition in the last degree improbable,—there would have been force and validity in the plea advanced by his friends. But it is scarcely fair to attempt to vindicate his secession, on the ground of actions occurring subsequent to that event, and greatly attributable to it. Mr. Lister's ordinary candor and fair dealing desert him on this point. He refuses to let the parliamentary leaders plead the faithlessness of the king in justification of their demands, arguing—inconclusively in our judgment—that the evidences of such faithlessness were furnished subsequently to these demands being made; while, at the same time, he seeks to defend the conduct of Hyde, on the ground of violences which were perpetrated long after his services had been transferred to

the court. The policy of such men as Hyde, Falkland, and Colepepper,—the recognized heads of the moderate party of the day,—only strengthened the hands of the king, without increasing the probabilities of a satisfactory adjustment of the great contest. They divided the strength of the liberal party, without obtaining in the councils of the monarch any compensatory weight. Charles gladly availed himself of their reputation, and promised to be guided by their advice; but there were other counsellors to whom he more readily listened, and by whom he was fatally led astray. A notable instance of this was furnished in his attempted arrest of the popular leaders; referring to which, in his 'History of the Rebellion,' Clarendon remarks, 'The three persons before-named, without whose privity the king had promised that he would enter on no counsel, were so much displeased and dejected, that they were inclined never more to take upon them the care of anything to be transacted in the house; finding already that they could not avoid being looked upon as the authors of these counsels *to which they were so absolute strangers, and which they so perfectly detested.*' By passing over to the king, Hyde and his associates strengthened the hands of a monarch who contemned their counsels, and pertinaciously adhered to the dogmas of an exploded tyranny. Charles was thus emboldened to refuse what he would otherwise have yielded: a delusive complexion was given to his cause which, serving to distract the real friends of freedom, rendered an appeal to arms inevitable.

The position occupied by Hyde, was less creditable than that of either of his friends. They became the acknowledged and responsible ministers of the crown, Falkland as secretary of State, and Colepepper, as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Hyde was intended for the Solicitor-generalship, in the place of St. John, who was to be dismissed, but he earnestly opposed the arrangement, assuring 'their majesties, that he should be able to do much more service in the condition he was in.' Duplicity and want of good faith were strikingly evidenced in the policy he now adopted. He was a spy in the popular camp, a liberal in profession, but a cavalier in heart, an intriguing deserter, who sought to recommend himself to his new master, by distracting the counsels and reporting the resolutions of his former associates. Every means which a cautious and timid policy could devise, were employed to conceal the part he was acting. His consultations with Falkland and Colepepper were held during the night, and his visits to the king were conducted with great secrecy. But it was impossible to elude the men against whom he was plotting. The place of 'the nightly meetings' was discovered, and Hampden—the most unspotted patriot in the long list of English worthies—reproached him

with his desertion, telling him, 'he well knew he had a mind 'they should be all in prison.' His opposition to the Remonstrance at length removed all disguise. This celebrated document, by which the popular leaders sought to stem the returning tide of loyalty, by reminding the nation of the grievous oppressions that had been practised, was zealously opposed by the king's friends. They dreaded its influence, and naturally endeavoured to prevent its adoption. The debate upon it was protracted and vehement, and Hyde exerted himself to the utmost. It was a crisis in the king's affairs, which compelled his adherents to throw aside all restraint; and from this moment consequently, Hyde, the secret associate of Falkland and Colepepper, became the open and zealous sharer of their councils.

The king's declarations were drawn up by him, and it is difficult to speak of them in terms too eulogistic. Their calm and constitutional tone was admirably adapted to serve the royal cause; and it is not, probably, too much to affirm, that Charles was mainly indebted to their influence, for the forces he was speedily enabled to array against the parliament.

'The complaints,' remarks our author, 'of the 'fruitlessness' of these declarations, and their insufficiency to 'convince the refractory,' proceed from a misconception both of their ultimate object, and of the party to whom they appealed. It was true, the time was past when the mighty quarrel could be decided by the pen. Every thing denoted an impending strife more terrible than that of words. It was improbable that the force of rhetoric would divert from their purpose the Parliament or the king, or that either expected to convince the other. Ostensibly they addressed each other, but virtually they appealed to a third party, the eventual umpire of the strife—the people. At this time, it was of little importance whether all that was published in the king's name gained for him one single vote in Parliament; but it was of great importance that he should be justified in the eyes of his subjects. To what extent his cause was strengthened by these appeals we cannot estimate; but it must be remembered that his success in mustering supporters greatly exceeded the expectations recorded by the candid and sagacious May, and said to have been expressed by Pym and Hampden. We must remember the flagrant imprudence (if it can be designated by so mild a term) by which the king had lowered the popularity of his cause: we must remember the superiority of means in the hands of the Parliament; and we shall then feel, that much of his unexpected success, in gathering adherents to his standard, may be attributed to the ability with which the royal cause had been thus pleaded before the nation.'—*Ib.* pp. 182-3.

The paper war which Clarendon so ably conducted, was incapable of arresting the ill-fortunes of his master. It brought recruits to his standard, and gave a temporary air of triumph

to his cause, but no sooner had Cromwell—the master-spirit of the age—succeeded in re-modelling the parliament's army, than its force became irresistible, and the discomfiture of the king was complete. The future protector appealed to the enthusiasm of his troops, and gave it full scope. The exercises of devotion were strangely blended, in their camp, with the discipline of war; and the result is known to every Englishman. Naseby field testified their valor, and decided the contest. During the alternations of the struggle, Hyde did his utmost to serve the king: but the impracticable nature of the materials with which he had to work, and the strong disgust which a long course of misrule had awakened throughout the kingdom, neutralised his efforts, and secured the triumph of his opponents. He was made Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1643, but with the exception of Falkland, Colepepper, and Southampton, there were few men about the king whom he could trust. Most of them were reckless and ambitious adventurers, whose venality and selfishness distracted and disgraced the royal cause. The court was a scene of perpetual intrigues. Men of mean passions and sinister views sought to build their own fortunes on the ruins of their country. The loyalty of the cavaliers,—so much lauded by modern writers,—was, with few exceptions, an irrational and headstrong passion, which saw nothing to admire in English liberty, nothing with which to sympathize in the aspirations of a generous and noble-minded people. It was an unenviable post which the official advisers of the king occupied, and they felt it bitterly. The military, headed by Rupert, despised them; and Charles, with his accustomed infatuation, lent himself to their machinations. Never was there a party, making loud pretensions to honor, which presented less worthy traits to the eye of posterity. It is a melancholy picture which Clarendon draws of the state of things at Oxford, the headquarters of the king; and those would do well to study it, who can find nothing to censure in the royalists, and nothing to commend among their opponents. 'The discomposures, jealousies, and disgusts,' he says, 'which reigned at Oxford, produced great inconveniences; and as many times, men in a scuffle lose their weapons, and light upon those which belonged to their adversaries, who again arm themselves with those which belonged to the others, such, one would have thought, had been the fortune of the king's army in the encounters with the enemy's; for those under the king's commanders grew insensible into all the license, disorder, and impiety with which they had reproached the rebels; and they into great discipline, diligence, and sobriety: which begot courage and resolution in them, and notable dexterity in achievements and enterprises. Insomuch as our side seemed to fight for monarchy, with the weapons of confusion, and the

‘other to destroy the king and government with all the principles and regularity of monarchy.’

Hyde's last interview with the king was on the 5th of March, 1645. On that day he departed with the young prince Charles to the West, in the hope of reconciling the dissensions, which existed among the royalist commanders, and of stimulating the zeal of the king's friends. The turn of affairs, however, speedily compelled the prince, accompanied by Hyde and Colepepper, to take shipping for Scilly, whence he escaped on the 16th of April, 1646, to Jersey.

From this time to 1660, Hyde lived in poverty and exile. The little court of the Second Charles exhibited in miniature all the worst features of that of his father. The prince himself was thoughtless, indolent, and depraved. Under the most favorable circumstances, he would probably have grown to manhood without developing any of the better qualities of our nature; but, circumstanced as he was, every vicious propensity was strengthened by unbridled indulgence. In the meantime, himself and his followers were suffering the extreme of poverty. In June, 1653, Clarendon writing to Nicholas, says :

‘I do not know that any man is yet dead for want of bread, which really I wonder at. I am sure the king himself owes for all he hath eaten since April; and I am not acquainted with one servant of his who hath a pistole in his pocket. Five or six of us eat together one meal a day, for a pistole a week; but all of us owe for God knows how many weeks to the poor woman that feeds us. I believe my Lord of Ormond hath not had five livres in his purse this month, and hath fewer clothes of all sorts than you have; and yet I take you to be no gallant.’—*Ib.*, pp. 374—375.

Despairing of success in any open attempt against the government of Cromwell, the royalists now basely plotted his assassination. He himself had been charged with a similar design against the late king, but his high, though perverted nature, shrunk with scorn from the charge. It had never entered his thoughts,—it was equally abhorrent from his feelings and his creed. But it was otherwise with Hyde. He connived at, if he did not directly encourage, the plots formed against the life of the Protector. There is good evidence of this, and Mr. Lister admits the fact. It is proved by his correspondence with Colonel Titus, and brands him with an infamy, which renders perfectly ridiculous the exaggerated praises of his admirers. In the teeth of such a fact, it is sheer folly, or rank party spirit, to describe Clarendon as a man of high moral principle. Faithful he might be, and undoubtedly was, to the worthless masters whom he served; but there must have been a radical unsoundness in his moral constitution, to have permitted a concurrence in so detestable a scheme.

It cannot be pleaded on his behalf, that his judgment was clouded, or his heart misled, by the impulse of a frenzied enthusiasm. He was the cool-blooded and calculating politician, who, himself unseen, encouraged the assassin purposes of his base agents. Little as we admire Clarendon, we wish, for the honor of our nature, and the reputation of a man once eminent in the councils of the nation, that we could disprove the charge.

At length came the Restoration,—a natural result of the military usurpation of Cromwell. In eschewing his early faith, that celebrated man had prepared the way for the events of 1660; and the fact was instantly visible, when his great spirit ceased to animate the government. He had disappointed a nation's hopes, had outraged its most cherished prepossessions, and was doomed to experience the bitterness of unsatisfied ambition. After his decease, the nation for a time reeled to and fro like a drunken man, and in despair of otherwise obtaining rest, hailed as its deliverer, one of the most worthless and contemptible of mortals. Mr. Lister contends that the Convention Parliament was right, in not exacting from the prince conditions favorable to public liberty; and Mr. Hallam agrees substantially with him, alleging that the early measures of the Long Parliament had provided all necessary safe-guards. Yet we venture to suggest, that the peculiar position and irritated state of parties, the immense interests at stake, the sum of good or evil which was about to be inflicted on the nation; did call for, and rendered imperative, some distinct understanding, which should pledge the king, so far as he could be pledged, to a line of policy best suited to the interests of his people. We hold, therefore, that Sir Matthew Hale was right, when he proposed the appointment of a Committee to draw up propositions for the king's acceptance; and that Monk only perfected his treachery, by opposing the suggestion. 'What,' said the perjured dissembler, 'have you to fear from a prince who has neither wealth to corrupt, nor an army to enslave you?'

Charles entered London on the 29th of May, 'with a triumph of about 20,000 horse and foot, brandishing their swords, and shouting with inexpressible joy; the ways strewed with flowers, the bells ringing, the streets hung with tapestry, and fountains running with wine.' Evelyn, whose words we have quoted, was present on the occasion, and his gratified loyalty attributed all to the divine interposition. 'I stood in the Strand,' he says, 'and beheld it, and blessed God. . . . It was the Lord's doing, for such a restauration was never mentioned in any history antient or modern, since the returne of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity.' It would have been more pertinent, and not less religious, to inquire whether the scene was not similar to that enacted in ancient times, when God gave to Israel a king

in his wrath. If any inference can be drawn from the character of the monarch and the tendency of his government, the case does not admit of doubt. A more disgraceful period than that which followed, does not occur in English history. A host of rapacious and profligate adventurers broke loose upon society. The worst vices of the continent were transplanted to England, the common decencies of life were outraged, and every semblance of piety was banished from the court. The unblushing profligacy of the king was but too faithfully imitated by his servants.

Hyde had been made Chancellor prior to the restoration, and shortly after that event, was created Baron Hyde, of Hindon, and subsequently, Earl of Clarendon. He was at the head of the king's government, and the circumstances of the day gave him immense power, for good or for evil. 'He was the first in place, 'favour, and authority, among the ministers of a monarch, who, 'while invested by the public with sovereign power, still evinced 'towards him the deference of a pupil.' Under such circumstances there is no want of candor, in holding Clarendon responsible for the measures which were adopted. He was the head and soul of the Administration, and the airs of dictatorship which he assumed, and which rendered his presence so unpalatable to his associates, are evidence of the view he took of his own position. Mr. Lister fairly argues that, in estimating his policy, as Prime Minister, much allowance must be made, on account of the rapid transition he had experienced. 'Power,' he remarks, 'gained, 'not by gradual steps, but by one stride, is doubly corrupting; 'and seldom has change been greater than that which a few weeks 'effected in the fortunes of Hyde.' But, after every allowance which can be fairly claimed, the administration of Clarendon will remain an inglorious epoch in our history, dishonorable to the premier, and injurious to the country. Our space must prevent us from glancing at more than two or three of his measures. The Declaration from Breda, drawn up by Clarendon, to prepare the way for his master's restoration, had promised 'a free and general pardon,' save in the case of those who should be excepted by Parliament. The limitation was understood to point at the late king's judges, and many of them, in consequence, sought to provide for their safety by flight. To prevent, it would seem, their escape, a heartless and treacherous proclamation was issued on the 6th of June, summoning all members of the Regicide Court, to surrender themselves within fourteen days, under pain of exclusion from pardon. The proclamation admitted but of one interpretation; and several of the king's judges relying on the integrity of its framers, rendered themselves up. Ludlow was among the number, having been advised by Sir Harbottle Grimston, the Speaker of the Commons, that 'it would be the most horrid

'thing in the world' should proceedings be instituted against those who did so. But it was soon apparent that the proclamation had been issued in ill-faith, —that it was the base artifice of a revengeful and blood-thirsty faction, to possess themselves of the persons of their enemies. Clarendon attempted to explain away the royal language, and to justify the trial and execution of the men who had been deluded by it; but the blood thus treacherously shed, though unhonoured at the moment, was not unproductive in after times. The case of Sir Henry Vane was one of accumulated treachery and baseness. He had not only refused to take any part in the trial of Charles the First, but was well known to have opposed it, and to have retired in consequence, for a season, from public affairs. There was no shadow of a justification, therefore, for the proceedings instituted against him,—proceedings artfully urged on by Clarendon, who advised that he should be excepted from the Bill of indemnity as 'a man of mischievous activity.' The Commons opposed the proposition, but ultimately gave way on the suggestion of Clarendon, that the two Houses should petition for his life. The crafty Chancellor had thus attained his object: Vane was at the mercy of his foes, and though a petition was presented on his behalf, and the king promised to grant its prayer, no sooner was a House of Commons assembled 'more slavish and more zealous for royalty' than the present, than they accomplished his death. 'Certainly,' said Charles in a letter to Clarendon, 'he is too dangerous a man to let live, if we can honestly put him out of the way.' Thus coolly was the best blood of England shed by a perfidious monarch, and his no less perfidious minister. We regret that Mr. Lister's partiality for his hero, has led him to extenuate the baseness of these transactions. The ideal perfection he assigns to Clarendon, militates fatally against the honesty of his narrative.

Of the ecclesiastical policy of his administration, we need say but little. It is well known to our readers, and constitutes one of the darkest chapters in the history of religious intolerance. Charles was mainly indebted to the Presbyterians for his restoration to the throne. They had plotted and suffered on his behalf, and were now doomed to experience the folly of trusting a man, whom no engagements could bind, and no services render grateful. So long as his return was problematical, they were deluded with vague promises, and were addressed in flattering speech, by episcopal sycophants and the ministers of the prince. In the Breda Declaration, 'liberty to tender consciences,' was expressly promised. 'No man,' said Charles, in language prepared by Clarendon, 'shall be disquieted, or called in question, for differences of opinion in matters of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom.' Such were the promises of the king and his adviser,—their fulfilment must be looked for in the atrocious

statutes, which emptied the pulpits of the Establishment, desecrated the ordinances of religion to the vile purposes of a party, robbed a large section of the community of their political rights, and reduced to poverty and banishment thousands of the best men whom England contained. The infatuated loyalty of the Presbyterians was repaid by confiscation, imprisonment, and exile. They merited punishment, but not surely at the hands of Charles, for whose restoration they had intrigued and labored. We have no sympathy with the Presbyterians as a party. They were behind their age, and were selfishly devoted to their own aggrandizement. Their intolerance in the Long Parliament drove the army to the employment of force, and furnished a pretext for the unconstitutional proceedings of Cromwell. Had they been faithful to their high trust,—had their policy been as sound as their power at one time was great,—had they listened to the reasonable demand for toleration made by the Independents and other sectaries; the government of the Commonwealth might have been established on an imperishable basis, and the intellect and morals of the nation, have been saved from the debasement which followed the restoration of the Stuarts. But nothing can extenuate the hollow and perfidious policy which was now adopted towards them. Appearances were preserved so long as the Convention Parliament lasted. Meetings were even appointed between the bishops and some divines of their persuasion, but the temper of the former may be gathered from the fear expressed by Sheldon to the Earl of Manchester, lest the terms of conformity should be so lax as to permit the Presbyterians to conform. When Baxter, in the course of the Savoy Conference, entreated the bishops 'not to cast out so many of their brethren through the 'nation as scrupled a ceremony which they confessed indifferent,' Sterne, the bishop of Carlisle, malignantly remarked, 'He will 'not say in a *kingdom*, lest he own a king,'—a mean and base insinuation, belied, as the false prelate well knew, by every act of Baxter's life. 'And now,' says Burnet, having related the proceedings at the Savoy, 'all the concern that seemed to employ 'the bishops' thoughts was, not only to make no alteration on 'their (the Presbyterians') account, but to make the terms of conformity much stricter than they had been before the war.'

Clarendon was a zealous abettor of episcopal intolerance. He was a thorough-going Church-of-England man, and, as a natural consequence, a bitter hater of all who dissented from her polity. The state church was his idol, and he labored in her service with all the rancor of the polemic, and the exasperation of personal hate. No sooner had a parliament assembled whose bigotry and hatred of religion could be successfully appealed to, than the Minister hurried them on in the work of persecution. Advantage was taken of the insurrection of a few mad fanatics under

Venner, a wine-cooper, to stimulate the bad passions of his hearers against the nonconformists as a body. No man knew better than Clarendon that both the Presbyterians and the Independents reprobated the insurrection of Venner as strongly as he did; yet he basely availed himself of it as a colorable pretext for his barbarous and bigoted policy. 'The seditious preachers,'—an equivocal phrase as issuing from such lips, and addressed to such auditors,—were denounced in terms sufficiently grateful to the frenzied zealots of prelacy; and their suppression was enforced by arguments well suited to arouse the worst passions. 'If you do not provide,' said Clarendon, 'for the thorough quenching these fire-brands; king, lords, and commons, shall be their meanest subjects, and the whole kingdom kindled into one general flame.' The Minister well knew, while uttering this language, how it would be understood. He was no stranger to the character of the materials of which the assembly before him was composed. It had been returned, under one of those frenzied excitements to which the English people are periodically subject. Intolerance and bigotry was now rampant, and their ordinary malevolence was aggravated to fury, by the remembrance of unpalatable restraints, and of recent wrongs. A wise man, mindful of his country rather than of a faction, would have sought to throw oil on the troubled waters, but Clarendon aimed to exasperate passion in order to effect the success of his dark policy.

We have left ourselves no space to advert to the character of his general administration, or to narrate the circumstances which led to his fall and banishment. In illustration of the former, we can only adduce his own statement, which identifies him, beyond all question, with the abettors of prerogative as opposed to popular liberty. 'He did never dissemble,' he says, speaking of himself, 'from the time of his return with the king, that the late rebellion could never be extirpated and pulled up by the roots, till the king's regal and inherent power and prerogative should be fully avowed and vindicated, and till the usurpations in both Houses of Parliament, since the year 1640, were disclaimed and made odious.' It is sheer folly in the face of such an exposition of his views, to speak of Clarendon as friendly to the constitutional liberties of England. Had he succeeded in carrying out his views, the tyranny of Charles the First, in its most palmy days, would have been revived and strengthened.

Clarendon died in exile, discarded by an ungrateful and worthless master. Various causes contributed to his fall. A nation's voice was raised against him, and Charles, the most mean-spirited and debased of mortals, was not sorry of a pretext to banish him from the realm. The steps of Clarendon's rapid descent, from almost unlimited power, to the pitiable and cringing position in which he closed his days, furnish an instructive lesson, to which we should

gladly advert, if we had not already greatly exceeded our limits. Of his writings we shall take another, and early opportunity to speak; and in the meantime, content ourselves with commending Mr. Lister's volumes, to the perusal of all who are interested in this most memorable period of English history. Our readers will not need to be informed, that we differ greatly from Mr. Lister in, his estimate of Clarendon's political character and career. He has suffered his admiration of the genius of the Chancellor, and his sympathy with his great reverses, to blind his judgment to the many obliquities of his course. Hence there is an air of romance, a want of reality throughout his sketch. It is the flattering likeness of a friendly artist, who has painted from fancy, rather than from life; has exhibited what his hero should be, rather than what he is. Bearing this in mind, every intelligent and well-read student will derive both information and pleasure from the perusal of his volumes; in which commendable diligence and extensive research are combined, with no inconsiderable skill, and with more than ordinary good temper.

Brief Notices.

Strictures on a Life of William Wilberforce. By the Rev. W. Wilberforce, and the Rev. S. Wilberforce. By Thomas Clarkson, M. A. With a Correspondence between Lord Brougham and Mr. Clarkson; also a Supplement, containing remarks on the Edinburgh Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Life, &c. London. Longman and Co. 8vo.

The Messrs. Wilberforce have little reason to congratulate themselves on their prudence, in having so wantonly assailed an aged philanthropist, the friend and early associate of their father. Mr. Clarkson, in the pamphlet before us, has vindicated himself from their charges in a manner which admits of no reply. His defence is perfectly triumphant, and is conducted in a calm and dignified tone, worthy both of his years and of his character. He may now repose in peace; his reputation is secure, and the cause of human virtue will be uninjured. What must be the feelings of his reverend detractors, it is not for us to say. One thing is obvious, that with the exception of the aid furnished by one kind *relative* in the Edinburgh Review, and the boisterous and unworthy zeal with which another *cousin* has undertaken their defence in the Christian Advocate, they are left to mourn their folly, without reaping its expected reward.

The Pilgrim's Progress. By John Bunyan. Most carefully collated with the edition containing the Author's last additions and corrections. With a Life of the Author, by Josiah Conder. Twenty-five Engravings. London: Fisher and Co. 8vo.

This is an exceedingly beautiful edition of a universal favourite. The 'Illustrations' and the 'Life' were first published in 1836, and

we see no reason, to reverse or modify, the judgment which the Eclectic then pronounced: 'In point of execution, the illustrations prove great manual skill in the artist; and they have been put into the hands of engravers who have done the utmost justice to the glowing and beautiful imaginings of the painter. Altogether, we have seldom seen a more truly ornamental series of designs to a popular work.' 'Vanity Fair,' by George Cruikshank—a rich subject for such an artist—is added to the collection, and leaves little more to be desired. The getting up of the volume is in harmony with the illustrations, and its value is greatly enriched by the brief memoir furnished by Mr. Conder. The present edition is fairly entitled to take precedence of all others, and as such we commend it to our readers.

Letters on Frequent Communion. By the late Rev. John M. Mason, D. D., of New York. With Introductory Remarks, by the Rev. John Morison, D. D. London. Ward. 1837.

This publication is a re-print of 'The Letters on Communion,' which Dr. Mason originally addressed to the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, on their cold and infrequent observance of the Lord's Supper. In some churches, this ordinance was administered only once in the year; in others once in six months; and in none more frequently than once in three months. His aim 'was to induce the churches of his native land to observe this sacrament weekly, which he conceived was the practice of primitive times. And, in the pursuit of this object, he has shown the piety of a Christian, the research of a divine, the learning of a scholar, and the argument of a logician.'

The introductory remarks by Dr. Morison concur to elucidate and enforce the argument of these 'letters;' and the volume primarily addressed to the Presbyterian Churches, may be read with profit by Christians of every denomination. Every communicant may find it useful in imparting enlightened views of the ordinance, and in calling into exercise the feelings suitable to its profitable observance.

The Dissenter. Vol. I. Stockton: W. Robinson. London: Groombridge. 1837.

This unpretending, but honest and interesting periodical, should have been noticed before. We have to apologise for the omission; which has not, however, been intentional. It is not merely intended to supply an antidote to the malignancy and falsehood of '*the Churchman*;' it is also designed to diffuse information respecting the principles and practice of Nonconformists, in a cheap and attractive form. It contains Essays on 'Religious Establishments;' and some of the doctrines of the Church of England which have a popish origin, are exhibited in their true light. It points out the leading peculiarities of most of the various sects which exist in the present day. Very many important, but difficult Scriptures, are critically examined, and satisfactorily explained: in short, its contents are varied, interesting, instructive, and plain. We give the work our very cordial and earnest recommendation; and we hope its circulation may be extensive.

The Stage; its Character and Influence. By John Styles, D. D. Fourth edition, revised. London: Ward and Co. 1838.

We are glad to meet with this very neat edition, of an admirable treatise which, cannot be widely circulated without the happiest results. It has been carefully revised by the author, and is now published at a greatly reduced price. With a keen perception of the charms of light literature, and a thorough sympathy with its better and more healthful forms, Dr. Styles exposes, with considerable power, the delusive pretensions and pernicious influence of theatrical amusements. We know few books more calculated for usefulness among the young, and parents and guardians will do well to place it in their hands.

Refutation of the Mis-statements and Calumnies contained in Mr. Lockhart's Life of Sir Walter Scott, respecting the Messrs. Ballantyne. By the Trustees and Son of the late Mr. James Ballantyne. London: Longman and Co. 1838.

A severe but well-merited castigation, inflicted by able hands, in a spirit equally honourable to themselves and to the parties whose character is vindicated. If Mr. Lockhart be the man we have supposed him to be, he will make prompt and full reparation for the injustice he has committed. Should he hesitate to do so, every ingenuous mind will know what inference to draw from his silence.

-
1. *Arboretum et Fruticetum Britannicum.* By J. C. Loudon, F.L.S., &c. 8 vols. 8vo. London: Longman & Co. 1838.
 2. *The Suburban Gardener and Village Companion.* By the same Author.
 3. *The Architectural Magazine.* No. LIV., August, 1838.

The *Arboretum Britannicum*, which we have before noticed during its progress, is at length completed, forming four thick volumes of letter-press, and four of plates; and though it considerably exceeds the size at first contemplated, there are, we should think, few who would not deem this inconvenience compensated by the additional value conferred on the work. If any fault is to be found, it is with the reiterated promises to despairing subscribers of a more speedy conclusion, rather than with the impossibility of fulfilling such pledges. This truly valuable work is certainly the completest of its kind ever published, (at least since the time of Solomon) and will form a necessary part of the library of every one who wishes to become thoroughly acquainted with the subject of Arboriculture. It contains portraits from nature of all the trees that endure the open air in Britain, with enlarged specimens of the flower and seed or fruit, besides numerous wood-cuts interspersed through the letter-press. The work displays great judgment, practical skill, and laborious research on the part of Mr. Loudon, and combines the *cream* of what has been before written on the subject with much that is original.

Of the second work, from the same indefatigable pen, we have as yet only seen a portion, and cannot pronounce on it as complete; but

it promises to form a very useful work. It relates to the formation and management of residences in the suburbs of large towns; including advice on the choice of a house, or the site of one; the arrangement and furnishing of the rooms; the management of the Villa farm; and the laying out of the grounds, from the miniature garden of one perch to an extent of fifty or sixty acres. There is much valuable information which is applicable to country residences as well as to suburban ones; as, for example, the sections on the choice of a house. The book is illustrated by numerous wood-cuts.

The Architectural Magazine, another of Mr. Loudon's publications, is not so much in our way, but we must give it a good word in passing. We are glad to see it going on prosperously. It opens a vehicle for architectural discussion which cannot fail to advance the progress of this noble art; and there are many papers in it which must render it interesting to every lover of constructive science and correct design, as well as to the professional man.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

Messrs. Fullarton and Co., of Glasgow, are about to publish a new edition of Percy's Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, with an Introduction and Life by George L. Craik, Esq., of the Inner Temple; in which the History of the Song and Ballad Poetry of England and Scotland, and that of each of the pieces given by Percy, will be brought down to the present day, and the views and statements of the Original Work illustrated, and corrected, where necessary, by the light which more recent inquiries have thrown upon the various departments of our poetical archæology. The work, which will be embellished with copies of such of the Original Engravings as are referred to in the text of Percy, will be printed in Four Volumes, crown 8vo. of which the first will comprehend the Introductory Discourse, and other preliminary matter; and the others, the Poems, with the Notes appended to each.

Isaiah: a New Translation. With Preliminary Dissertations, and a Critical, Philological, and Exegetical Commentary. By the Rev. Dr. Henderson.

Text-Book of Popery. By the Rev. J. M. Cramp. A new and enlarged edition.

A Narrative of the Greek Mission; or Sixteen Years in Malta and Greece: comprising allusions to the Domestic Habits, Moral State, Natural History, Mediæval Vicissitudes, Geology, Language, Poetry, and Politics of Greece; Notices of Malta, and Hints to Travellers and Missionaries. By the Rev. Samuel Sheridan Wilson. In One handsome volume, with Illustrations.

Aids to Memory; or the Principal Facts and Dates of the Old Testament History, and of the subsequent History of the Jews to the period of the Incarnation, embodied in short Mnemonic sentences on the plan of Mrs. J. Slater's Sententia Chronologica. By Mrs. Jukes. With a Recommendatory Preface by Professor Vaughan.

The Claims of Episcopacy Refuted; in a Review of the Essays of the Right Rev. Bishop Hobart, and other Advocates of Diocesan Episcopacy. By the late Rev. John Mason, D.D. With an Introduction and Appendix, by the Rev. John Blackburn, Minister of Claremont Chapel, Pentonville. In One small 12mo. volume.

The Transactions of the Royal Geological Society of Cornwall. Vol. V. 8vo. With many Tables and Plates. Containing: 1.—On the Metalliferous Deposits of Cornwall and Devon. By W. J. Henwood, F.G.S., H. M. Assay Master of Tin. 2.—On the China Stone of Cornwall. By John Hawkins, Esq., F.R.S. 3.—On the Serpentine of Pennare. By Rev. Canon Rogers.

4.—On the Elvan-dykes of the Land's End. By the Rev. G. Pigott. With several other Papers on the Geology of Cornwall, and tabular statements of the produce of the Cornish Mines for many years.

Just Published.

An Inquiry into the History and Theology of the Ancient Vallenses and Albigenes; as exhibiting, agreeably to the promises, the perpetuity of the sincere church of Christ. By George Stanley Faber, B.D. 8vo.

Conversations for Children; on Land and Water. By Mrs. Marcet.

Twenty Essays on the Practical Improvement of God's Providential Dispensations; as Means of Moral Discipline to the Christian.

Millennarianism Unscriptural; or a glance at some of the consequences of that theory.

Memoir of Mrs. Louisa A. Lowrie, of the Northern Indian Mission. With Introductory Notices by the Rev. E. P. Swift, the Rev. W. H. Pearce, and the Rev. Dr. Reed.

The Management of Bees. With a description of the 'Ladies' Safety Hive.' By Samuel Bagster, Jun. With Fifty illustrative Wood Engravings.

A Course of Lectures to Young Men and Others. By Ministers in connexion with the Christian Instruction Society.

Hoaryhead, and the Valleys Below; or Truth through Fiction. By Jacob Abbott.

An Essay on Apostolical Succession: being a Defence of a genuine Protestant Ministry, against the exclusive and intolerant schemes of Papists and High Churchmen; and supplying a general antidote to Popery. By Thomas Powell, Wesleyan Minister.

State Trials; Specimen of a New Edition. By Nicholas Thirning Moile, Esq. 8vo.

New Zealand; being a Narrative of Travels and Adventures, during a residence in that country between the years 1831 and 1837. By J. S. Polack, Esq., Member of the Colonial Society of London. 2 vols. 8vo.

Strictures on a Life of William Wilberforce, by the Rev. W. Wilberforce and the Rev. S. Wilberforce. By Thomas Clarkson, M.A. With a Correspondence between Lord Brougham and Mr. Clarkson: also a Supplement, containing Remarks on the Edinburgh Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Life, &c. 8vo.

Refutation of the Mis-statements and Calumnies contained in Mr. Lockhart's Life of Sir Walter Scott, respecting the Messrs. Ballantyne. By the Trustees and Son of the late Mr. James Ballantyne.

The Call upon the Church; considered in Two Essays. By W. Roberts, Esq., M.A., and the Rev. W. Nicholson, M.A. To which the Prize of Two Hundred Guineas was awarded by the Christian Influence Society.

The Life of St. Chrysostom. Translated from the German of Dr. Neander, by the Rev. J. C. Stapleton, M.A. F.L.S. Vol. I. 8vo.

Letters from Ireland, 1837. By Charlotte Elizabeth.

Essays on the Church. By a Layman. A new Edition, with some observations on existing circumstances and dangers.

Demonstration of the Truth of the Christian Religion. By Alexander Keith, D.D., Author of 'The Evidences of Prophecy,' &c.

The Evidences of Divine Revelation. By Daniel Dewar, D.D., Principal of Marischal College and University, Aberdeen.

A Vindication of the Book of Genesis, addressed to the Rev. William Buckland, D.D. By the Rev. Fowler De Johnstone.

Lives of the most Eminent Literary and Scientific Men of France. Vol. I. (Lardner's Cyclopædia, Vol. CV.)

Journal of an Expedition from Singapore to Japan, with a Visit to Loo-Choo; descriptive of these Islands and their inhabitants, &c. By P. Parker, M.D. Revised by the Rev. Andrew Reed, D.D.

Condensed Discourses, or Pulpit Helps; designed chiefly for those who are entering on the sacred office. By a Minister.

The Life of Hannah More: with Notices of her Sisters. By Henry Thompson, M.A., Curate of Wrington, Somerset.